DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 132 942 HE 008 514

AUTHOR	Hanford, George H.
TITLE	An Inquiry into the Need for and Feasibility of a National Study of Intercollegiate Athletics. A Report to the American Council on Education.
INSTITUTION	American Council on Education, Washington, D.C.
SPONS AGENCY	Carnegie Corp. of New York, N.Y.; Ford Foundation, New York, N.Y.
PUB DATE	22 Mar 74
NOTE	159p.; For related document, see HE 008 685
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.83 HC-$8.69 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Athletic Programs; *Athletics; Attitudes; Educational Philosophy; Educational Policy; Ethics; Financial Problems; Financial Support; *Higher Education; *Intercollegiate Programs; National Surveys; Needs Assessment; *Problems
IDENTIFIERS	Competition

ABSTRACT

An inquiry was conducted during the period of October 1973 through March 1974 to assess the need for a more comprehensive study of intercollegiate sports in the United States. A number of observations were made: (1) Although sports as entertainment can be expected to continue to play an increasingly important role in our society, big-time collegiate athletics can be expected to continue to lose ground, despite some appearance to the contrary; (2) today the definition of amateurism must be given in degrees of nonprofessionalism, and even so, the concept remains controversial; (3) national solutions will be difficult to develop in light of regional differences; and (4) colleges and universities are not at the same stage of development in the evolution of their athletic programs. The findings of the inquiry are in six major categories: (1) individual attitudes of the parties-at-interest; (2) commericalism, entertainment, and ethics; (3) controlling competition; (4) economics; (5) the relationship of sports and education; and (6) issues to be considered in a study by a national Commission on Intercollegiate Sports. The last category includes moral, financial, educational, social, and philosophical questions. (Author/MSE)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED132942

AN INQUIRY INTO THE NEED FOR AND FEASIBILITY OF A NATIONAL STUDY OF INTERCOLLEGIATE ATHLETICS

George H. Hanford

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

American Council on Education

TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER.

AMERICAN COUNCIL ON EDUCATION
ONE DUPONT CIRCLE
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20036

OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

June 24, 1974

Dear Colleague:

The report which follows is a copy of the principal section of a longer report to the American Council on Education on a recent inquiry into the need for and feasibility of a national study of intercollegiate athletics. It presents the findings of a six months' investigation, under the direction of George H. Hanford, into the desirability of undertaking a comprehensive study of college sports. The study was conducted on behalf of the Council with funds provided by the Carnegie Corporation of New York and the Ford Foundation.

In the interests of timeliness and economy, this report of the principal inquirer is being distributed in unedited form, unaccompanied by the synopsis and appendixes which, respectively, precede and follow it in the total documentation submitted to the Council. The synopsis, in addition to summarizing the findings, calls explicitly for the establishment of a commission on collegiate sports. The appendixes report on substudies in nine specific areas. Only a very limited number of copies of the 400-page volume of appendixes have been duplicated, and they will be made available on a first-come, first-served basis.

Your comments on the report are invited, as is your advice as to whether the ACE should undertake to mount the commission effort called for in the report.

Sincerely yours,

Roger W. Heyns

Roger W. Heyns

A report to the

AMERICAN COUNCIL ON EDUCATION

on

An Inquiry into

THE NEED FOR AND FEASIBILITY OF A NATIONAL STUDY OF INTERCOLLEGIATE ATHLETICS

George H. Hanford

March 22, 1974

© 1974 by American Council on Education
One Dupont Circle, Washington, D.C. 20036

Printed in the United States of America

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION 1

A PREFATORY NOTE. 2

A DEMURRER. 3

CONDUCT OF THE INQUIRY. 4
The Form of the Inquiry. 5
The Inquiry Team 6

BACKGROUND CLASSIFICATIONS. 7
Taxonomy of Intercollegiate Sports 8
Taxonomy of Institutions 11
Regional Variations. 14

TRENDS. 17
Sports in Society Today. 18
Intercollegiate Athletics in the World of Sports . . . 20
The Athletic Procession. 21
Amateur versus Professional. 25

INDIVIDUAL ATTITUDES 27
EDUCATIONAL COMMUNITIES 27
Trustee Attitudes. 27
Presidential Attitudes 28
Admissions and Financial Aid Officer Attitudes 31
Faculty Attitudes. 32
Student Attitudes. 35
Athlete Attitudes. 36
Professional Attitudes 37
Alumni Attitudes 39
Parental Attitudes 41

SECONDARY SCHOOL ATTITUDES. 42

MINORITIES. 46

WOMEN 49

THE COUNTERCULTURE. 52

PUBLIC ATTITUDES. 53
The Public as Fan or Spectator 53
The Public, as in "Public Relations" 54
The Courts 55
State Attitudes. 57
The U.S. Congress. 60
The Public in Summary. 61

COMMERCIALISM, ENTERTAINMENT, AND ETHICS 63

COMMERCIALISM IN INTERCOLLEGIATE ATHLETICS 63

INTERCOLLEGIATE ATHLETICS AS ENTERTAINMENT 65

PROFESSIONAL SPORTS AND THE MEDIA 67
Professional Sports 67
Television 70
The Press 72
Radio 74

COMPETITIVE EXCESSES 74
Financial Aid in Intercollegiate Athletics 76
Medical Concerns 78
The Incidence of Competitive Excesses 80

CONTROLLING COMPETITION 83

WINNING PER SE 83

NATIONAL ASSOCIATIONS AND CONFERENCES 84
The National Associations of Institutions 84
Athletic Conferences 86
The National Associations of Individuals 89

POLICING INTERCOLLEGIATE ATHLETICS 89

ACCREDITATION 91

EXTERNAL CONTROLS 95
The NCAA-AAU Feud 96
International Competition 99

ECONOMICS 102
Football Finances 106
Student Fees 107
The Energy Crisis 108

SPORTS AND EDUCATION 110

POLICY CONTROL AND ADMINISTRATION 111

INTERCOLLEGIATE ATHLETICS AND THE EDUCATIONAL PROCESS . . . 113
The Well-Rounded Concept 117
The Athletic Standard of Living 119

INTRAMURAL, EXTRAMURAL, AND CLUB SPORTS 120
Intramural Sports 120
Extramural or Club Sports 122
Graduate Students and Intercollegiate Athletics . . . 123

SPORTS AND EDUCATION--continued

PHYSICAL EDUCATION. 124

EDUCATION OF THE ATHLETE. 127
The Preprofessional Athlete. 127
Academic Performance and Persistence of Athletes . . . 131

SCHOLARLY INATTENTION 133

ISSUES FOR CONSIDERATION BY THE COMMISSION. 135

THE MORAL ISSUES. 137
Unethical Practices. 138
Discrimination Against Minority Athletes 139
Discrimination Against Women 139

THE FINANCIAL ISSUES. 139

THE EDUCATIONAL ISSUES. 141
Relationship to Educational Mission. 141
Policy Determination 142

SOME RELATED ISSUES 143
Sports and the Learning Process. 145
Sports and the Social Institution. 145
Sports and the Corporate Institution 146
Sports and the Citizen 146
Sports and Human Rights. 147

RESEARCH APPROACH 147

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS 150

INTRODUCTION

This introduction to the main body of the report on the inquiry into the need for and feasibility of a national study of intercollegiate athletics, in addition to outlining the organization of the report on the findings of the inquiry, consists of five sections designed to provide background information regarding the approach taken in the report, the conduct of the effort, the prejudices of the inquiry team, the classification of sports and institutions, and those trends which seem most to be affecting intercollegiate sports in the spring of 1974. The balance of the report is organized under six major headings:

I. Individual Attitudes, which describes the attitudes and influences of the several parties-at-interest.

II. Commercialism, Entertainment, and Ethics, which makes the case that current excesses in the recruitment and exploitation of athletes are in large measure the result of the commercial involvement of big-time college sports in the entertainment business.

III. Controlling Competition, which treats the problem of dealing with those unethical excesses.

IV. Economics, which presents the economic plight of college sports.

V. Sports and Education, which argues that the relationship between higher education and intercollegiate sports, both big-time and low-profile, needs to be reexamined and strengthened.

VI. Issues to be Studied, which summarizes the questions with which a national study Commission of Intercollegiate Sports must

inevitably deal and organizes them for treatment by that body.

A "summary of the findings" of the inquiry appears under that very title at the beginning of this report.

By way of background:

A PREFATORY NOTE: As noted at the beginning of this document, it is presented in three levels of exposition and argumentation: the synopsis just completed, the main report just beginning, and the appendices, which comprise its second volume. Because of the length of the primary report, the reader will perhaps be tempted to by-pass the appendices. Such an approach would be unfortunate, for the appendices form an integral part of the document and do so particularly in three cases: the papers dealing with economics, minorities, and women. Like the appendix dealing with developments since 1929, they report the findings of special inquiries which extended virtually throughout the entire six months' project period. No summaries of them, such as those presented in the principal report, could do full justice to their significance; attention to their full presentation is essential to a comprehensive understanding of this report.

The other appendices, though more limited in terms both of their final focus and of the time devoted to specific inquiry for their preparation, are more catholic in their introductory coverage and add important dimensions and distinctive flavors to many elements of the main report. The frequent references to them in its text attest to the integral part which they play in the fabric of the entire document.

In short, if the task of taking on the principal-report-and-the-appendices seems too burdensome, it is suggested that the reader simply re-read the synopsis.

A DEMURRER: Any exercise that is focussed on problems, as this inquiry was obliged to do, runs the danger of producing a polemic, in this case, of running down the entire intercollegiate athletic enterprise. Despite impressions to the contrary that may be developed in the course of reading this report, there is much more that is good about intercollegiate athletics than is bad. Observations in two contexts help make the point.

First, with respect to the people who are responsible, while there is much that may at first glance appear to be bad or dishonest or hypocritical or unethical that goes on in the name of intercollegiate sports, one discovers that the people connected with them are for the most part individuals of good will and good intention. Sometimes, however, circumstances force upon them a narrowness of focus which appears to the casual observer to distort their vision and their values: the athletic director who, though employed explicitly to put an athletic program on a self-sufficient basis, is accused of crass commercialism; the coach, who though hired by an athletic director explicitly to produce a winning team in order to put the athletic department in the black, is accused of an overemphasis on winning; the athletic representative at an association or conference meeting who, instructed by his president to protect the institution's interests at all costs, appears to be voting contrary to the interests of the individual athlete in whose name, after all, the whole enterprise is said to be conducted; the college or university president who, preoccupied with a million and

one other problems affecting his institution, is accused either of neglecting intercollegiate sports or condoning their excesses. On occasion, of course, pressures push a few people too far. It is their actions which produce the ethical problems which in part prompted the call for this inquiry, and it is their actions on which this report necessarily concentrates.

Second, with respect to the students who participate in intercollegiate sports, while there have been instances of discrimination, exploitation, and favoritism, there have been countless cases of fair treatment and fair play. While some athletes have emerged disillusioned about the role of intercollegiate sports and said so, there are many, many others who count the experience as positive and recall it with pleasure. And while there are those who dispute the time-honored attribution of character-building qualities to today's big-time sports, there are those who believe that intercollegiate athletes, both low-profile and big-time, help mold people in ways that are essentially good.

To put both aspects of this demurrer in unoriginal terms, while there are conditions on the college sports scene that need cleaning up, intercollegiate athletics should not be thrown out with the bath water. For this reason, *the inquiry team sought not to find out what is bad about intercollegiate athletics so they can be investigated and corrected, but rather to seek a framework for study which holds promise of strengthening something that is basically good.*

CONDUCT OF THE INQUIRY: The inquiry was conducted during the period October 1, 1973 to April 1, 1974, under the direction of George H. Hanford, who acted as the principal inquirer and coordinator of the efforts of

a number of part-time consultants. Mr. Hanford's activities, underwritten by an originating grant of $15,000 from the Carnegie Corporation, were concerned generally with all aspects of intercollegiate athletics. Honoraria and expenses of the consultants were more than covered by a supplementary grant of $57,750 from the Ford Foundation, with each individual making special inquiry in one or two specific areas. The reports of the consultants are indicated as appendices to the report of the principal inquirer, who takes full responsibility for its contents, as they take responsibility for theirs.

Form of the Inquiry: The inquiries were conducted through reviews of the published literature and other documents, correspondence, telephone conversations, and personal interviews. Campuses in all sections of the country were visited; large and small; men, women, and coed; two- and four-year; public, independent, and church-related. Meetings, conferences, and conventions were attended. In the process, contacts were made with trustees, presidents, and other administrators; athletic directors, coaches, trainers, athletic department business managers, ticket managers, sports information directors and faculty athletic representatives; faculty members, including sociologists, historians, economists, lawyers, philosophers, political scientists, and physical educators; students; college athletes, past and present, men and women; and college sports fans. Contacts were also made with appropriate personnel from secondary schools and their athletic associations; national collegiate athletic associations and athletic conferences; the field of television, and the world of professional sports; with sportswriters and referees; indeed with anyone who the inquiry team thought might make a

contribution. Virtually without exception, everyone with whom the inquiry team came in contact was most cooperative and helpful and many individuals went out of their way to lend a hand.

The Inquiry Team: The inquiry team consisted of

- Carlos Alvarez, second-year law student at Duke University, working under the supervision of Professor John Weistart. Alvarez reviewed and reported on cases before the courts involving intercollegiate athletics. (See Appendix A)

- Robert H. Atwell, President of Pitzer College, who reviewed and interpreted information dealing with the economic aspects of college sports. (See Appendix B)

- Jerry Beasley, doctoral candidate in education at Stanford University, who looked into the legislative interests in intercollegiate athletics at the state level. (See Appendix C)

- Roscoe C. Brown, Jr., Director of the Institute of Afro-American Affairs, New York University, who directed a team effort concerned with questions relating to the involvement of minorities, primarily Blacks, in college sports and prepared the summary report. (See Appendix D). His co-workers were:

  Leon Coursey, Head of Physical Education and Director of Athletics, University of Maryland, Eastern Shore

  Melvin Evans, Chairman of Physical Education, Jackson State College, Mississippi

  Robert Green, Director of the Center for Urban Studies, Michigan State University

  Charles D. Henry, Head, Department of Health, Physical Education and Recreation, Grambling College, Louisiana

  Nell Jackson, Assistant Director of Athletics, Michigan State University

  John Loy, Professor Sociology and Physical Education, University of Massachusetts

  Drs. Coursey, Evans, Green, Henry, Jackson and Loy were responsible as indicated thereon for the several attachments to Dr. Brown's paper.

- Bernard P. Ireland, former member of the College Board staff and director of admissions at Columbia College, who assisted Mr. Hanford in the general inquiry, putting special emphasis on and preparing a paper on historical developments since the 1929 Carnegie report. (See Appendix F)

- Theodore Lowi, with Isaac Kramnick (like Dr. Lowi, a professor of political science) and Carl Scheingold (professor of sociology), all of Cornell University. Dr. Lowi was the author of the appendix dealing with the political implications of intercollegiate athletics. Dr. Kramnick assisted Dr. Lowi and with Dr. Scheingold also prepared some useful supplementary notes for Mr. Hanford's use. (See Appendix G)

- Mary McKeown, recipient of her doctorate in education from the University of Illinois during the course of the inquiry, who made the special study and prepared the report on women in intercollegiate sports. (See Appendix H)

- Felix Springer, doctoral candidate at Columbia University, who reviewed and reported on the experience of institutions which had given up intercollegiate football; he also assisted in the final stages of preparation of the basic report. (See Appendix I)

- Yvonne Wharton, Mr. Hanford's assistant at the College Board, who, at project expense, not only reviewed and prepared some supplementary notes for him on the literature of the counter-culture to the intercollegiate athletic establishment, but also was responsible for the actual production of the report and its appendices.

- Special consultant help was provided by Joseph Froomkin, Incorporated. Under Dr. Froomkin's direction, his firm analyzed and reported on the more general implications for college sports of the proposals before the U.S. Congress protecting the rights of amateur athletes. (See Appendix E). Dr. Froomkin also advised Mr. Hanford in the preparation of the final document.

- Mr. Hanford, on sabbatical leave from his position as Executive Vice President of the College Entrance Examination Board, devoted full-time to direction of the project from October 1, 1973 to April 1, 1974.

BACKGROUND CLASSIFICATIONS: Early in the course of the inquiry it became clear that bases would be needed for sorting out sports and institutions on a national scene characterized by great regional variations. No simple categorization could be made in either dimension,

but the following attempts provided the inquiry team with a reasonable background against which to make its observations.

Taxonomy of Intercollegiate Sports: Any attempt to classify intercollegiate sports begins with a difficulty in defining just what sports are intercollegiate. The NCAA recognizes eighteen; the AIAW, twenty-one. The eighteen are baseball, basketball, cross country, fencing, football, golf, gymnastics, ice hockey, lacrosse, skiing, soccer, swimming, tennis, indoor track, outdoor track, volleyball, water polo, and wrestling. Unique to the women in formal intercollegiate competition are field hockey and badminton. However, colleges formally compete with each other at what is considered the varsity level in other, not so formally recognized sports as well; for instance, in sailing and in crew, for both men and women. Men also engage less formally in some of these and other sports such as touch football or rugby. And intramural teams often engage ungrammatically in inter-institutional events such as the Big 10 intramural basketball tournament.

Although the concerns which prompted this inquiry are related primarily to college sports at the varsity level, it should be recognized that intercollegiate athletics cannot be considered totally apart from sports which are intramural or extramural or from other amateur sports which are not normally associated with college programs. This latter group includes such activities as figure and speed skating, equestrian events, and marksmanship. The existence of these other sports is important to the consideration given later in this report to the relationship of intercollegiate athletics to international competition. So, too, is the fact that, while college programs may be the primary

source of U.S. representation in international competition in some sports, amateur clubs can be an equally or more important source in others. The appendices by Joseph Froomkin and Theodore Lowi (Appendices E and G, respectively) provide fascinating commentary not only on the differences among amateur sports but also on the need to differentiate among the participant and spectator aspects of them.

Among college-level varsity sports themselves, classification along several dimensions is necessary to an analysis of the problems of intercollegiate athletics. The financial and most commonly used classifications for men are the big-time, revenue-producing sports (football and basketball) and the low-profile, non-revenue-producing (all others). This nomenclature is, however, meaningless in women's sports and both misleading and inadequate for the men. Only big-time football is generally revenue-producing. Big-time basketball frequently, but far from always, makes its own financial way. Hockey is in a few but growing number of institutions becoming a revenue-producing sport. With only a very few abnormal exceptions, all other varsity sports, along with non-big-time or low-profile football and most basketball and hockey programs do not pay their own way. Despite its complexity, this distinction is an important one nonetheless, for *the major differences among institutions in their policies and practices with respect to the financing of intercollegiate sports rest upon differing expectations with respect to revenue production by football and basketball.*

Another basis for classification has to do with the difference between team and individual sports, a difference which obviously also

applies to other than college-level varsity sports. Again this single division is too gross to be useful. While football and basketball are clearly team sports and golf and tennis individual sports, basketball is less a team sport than football and tennis doubles more a team sport than golf. This degree of difference is important in respect to recruiting. The more individual a sport the more effectively can performance in it be measured. For instance, times in track and swimming events are available for scrutiny. And among the big-time sports, *because individual performance in basketball is so much more important than in football, recruiting for the former is much more vicious than for the latter.*

Finally of course there are the distinctions already noted that exist with respect to sex, an important difference when one is considering the demands of women for equality of treatment. There are also differences in the contact and the non-contact sports, with controversy over whether women should or should not be allowed to partake of the former together with men or only in contact (sic) with each other. And there are the non-contact individual sports like swimming and tennis where the propriety of integrated competition is less in question.

Analysis on all of the foregoing grounds suggests (1) that big-time football and big-time basketball deserve individually distinct classification, distinct that is from each other and from all other college sports, for men and women, including low-profile football and basketball, in any national study of intercollegiate athletics, and (2) that the differences among the other sports need always to be kept carefully in mind.

Taxonomy of Institutions: Many of the complexities involved in consideration of the problems of intercollegiate athletics are rooted in the diversity of American higher education, a diversity which is exhibited along a number of dimensions.

Institutional level represents one basis for differentiation, for the problems of universities, four-year colleges, and two-year colleges with respect to intercollegiate athletics are in many instances different. Although the central thrust of the concerns which prompted the call for this inquiry bears primarily upon university-sponsored sports, many of the considerations involved have implications for four- and two-year college-sponsored athletic programs. For instance, the growth of television, the burgeoning of professional sports and the attitudes of the press have had important influence not only upon big-time university sports but also upon low-profile ones at two- and four-year colleges. Furthermore, the latter are themselves facing serious financial problems. And in quite a different context, the two-year colleges play a special role as a source of scholar athletes to four-year varsity programs. For these and similar reasons any national study of intercollegiate athletics should take account of the problems of intercollegiate athletics in all three kinds.

Type of control is another basis for differentiation, for there are variations in the ways in which publicly supported, church-supported, and independent higher institutions relate to the problems of intercollegiate athletics. At the risk of gross oversimplification, it would appear, for instance, that the financial problems in sports as in higher education generally are more severe at independent and church-supported

institutions than at publicly supported ones, that a substantial majority of big-time football programs (83 out of 131 so-classified) are sponsored by publicly supported universities, and that this imbalance is much less pronounced in the case of basketball because many more church-related colleges participate in big-time basketball than in football. With over half of the 45 independent big-time institutions not playing football being church-supported, there are 109 independent and 130 public universities playing big-time basketball. An important subset of institutions are the 151 that have given up football since 1939; of these only ten are publicly supported. (See Felix Springer's report on the subject, which appears as Appendix I).

(Another classification, harder to come by but one that should ultimately be made, would type institutions with regard to their handling of men's and women's intercollegiate sports, identifying those which offer separate but equal programs, integrated programs, etc.)

The collegiate athletic associations provide still another basis for classification. Although it was until this past year divided into only two units, the University and College Divisions, the NCAA reorganized in 1973 by establishing what are in effect four units: Division I (institutions with big-time athletic programs) including football, Division I (big-time) except football, Divisions II and III (with low-profile programs). Two other important classifications exist in the membership of the NAIA and in the two-year colleges served by the NCJCAA and the California JCAA. These six classifications are, however, not mutually exclusive. NCAA Division II and III colleges may choose to compete in one or two sports other than football at a higher level.

Furthermore, there is an overlap in membership between the NAIA and NCAA Division II and III colleges which reflects a commonality of interest and aspiration among these three groups. In all except one case, four-year colleges and universities are free to choose their classification. The exception is in football, where the designation as a Division I or big-time football program is made by the NCAA.

For the purposes of this discussion it would appear that there are these pertinent institutional classifications. There are playing big-time football:

83	public institutions
48	independent institutions
131	

Including these 131, there are playing big-time basketball

130	public institutions
109	independent institutions
239	

Playing in NCAA Division II there are

97	public institutions
98	independent institutions (55 of them in the Northeast)
195	

Playing in NCAA Division III there are

59	public institutions (51 of them in the Northeast)
174	independent institutions
233	

These figures confirm the generally held beliefs that big-time sports and big-time football in particular are more prevalent in public institutions than in private ones and that the further an institution is from the big-time the more likely it is to be independent.

Interpretations aside, however, *it will be important* for the proposed national study of intercollegiate athletics *to recognize and take account of that particular facet of the diversity of higher education in the United States which is reflected in their differing attitudes and interests with respect to intercollegiate athletics*. For the purposes of the inquiry and in the understanding of this report, it should be noted that the 239 institutions comprising NCAA Division I are considered to have big-time athletic programs and that the 131 Division I institutions playing football are considered to have big-time football programs. All other institutions, including members of NAIA and AIAW not already covered, are considered to have low-profile programs involving low-profile sports.

Regional Variations: Any analysis of the national intercollegiate sports scene is further complicated by regional differences which are in turn rendered difficult to study because of variations in the way the country is divided up for education-related purposes. The eight Districts recognized by the NCAA, for instance, are not coincident with the areas served by the regional accrediting associations. Unfortunately, they are not even mutually exclusive on a geographical basis. Iowa and Iowa State are, for example, in different NCAA districts, as are Colorado and Colorado State. Nevertheless, allowing for considerable geographical imprecision, some reasonable generalizations can be made.

The major single difference exists between the Northeast and the rest of the country. In that section -- the states generally comprising the NCAA's Districts One and Two and the New England and Middle States accrediting associations -- independent higher education has been pre-

eminent and a majority of the leading universities, both in academics and in athletics, are privately supported. While many of them are nationally ranked academically, very few of them or their publicly supported brethren are nationally ranked in football. In terms of big-time programs, the northeast membership is skewed away from Division I football; only 21 of 42 Division I members play it. In the rest of the country the proportion is almost reversed, as 110 play Division I football against only 66 who do not. Thus, the northeast's outlook on the intercollegiate sports scene, wherein football plays such a nationally unique and dominant role, tends to differ from that of the other sections of the country. A different outlook also exists with respect to basketball. While there are many large on-campus basketball facilities in other sections of the country, colleges and universities aspiring to basketball prominence in the northeast have relied on big-city public arenas, a practice which has of course put many of them into direct competition with professional franchises making use of the same facilities. Also, it is not surprising to find that over one-third of the non-football playing Division I colleges in the country are in the city-filled District II, aspiring to athletic prominence, if not on the gridiron, then on the basketball courts.

At institutions with lower-profile programs, too, Division II and III of the NCAA, the Northeast (District One and Two) differs from the other areas of the country. In Division II, for instance, the Northeast is dominated by independent institutions, while in the rest of the country, public ones predominate. In Division III, on the other hand, 51 of the 59 publicly supported colleges are in Districts One and Two. These figures

suggest then that the northeast tends to put less emphasis not only on football but on intercollegiate sports generally than the rest of the country.

The northeast is also organized in a way which is quite different from that used internally in other sections of the country. The Eastern College Athletic Conference is in effect a unique regional NCAA which, sitting as it does between the NCAA and such few formal conferences as do exist in the area, may possibly have discouraged the formation of other such conferences by making available a substitute for the services provided in other regions by such institutional groupings. The Eastern College Athletic Conference establishes rules for the conduct of games and of athletic departments within the national standards established by the NCAA, provides officials, acts in fact or in effect as amicus curiae in legal cases involving its member institutions. With over two hundred members, the ECAC is many times larger than the more usual conferences of from six to ten members that exist elsewhere.

Despite these significant differences between the northeast and the rest of the country, there are ways in which the other regions differ from each other. The Southeast District III, for instance, is the largest after District II and has the greatest number and proportion of big-time (Division I) programs, especially football programs, both public and private. The Midwest (Districts IV and V) has, not surprisingly, in view of the preeminence of its public higher institutions, the largest number and proportion of publicly supported big-time football programs and its public membership is almost exclusively in Division I and II. Meanwhile its independent membership is skewed in the other direction,

with 66 of the 67 of the Division II and III colleges in District IV and V being privately supported. Districts VI, VII, and VIII are smaller and harder to categorize, although the West Coast (VIII) as far as NCAA membership is concerned tends to look very much like a smaller version of the Southeast (III).

In interpreting the foregoing observations, which are based essentially on NCAA membership data, it is important to note that they do not include data from the other major national athletic associations of four-year institutions, the NAIA, whose approximately 565 members are organized essentially on state-wide bases and would appear to operate at the NCAA Division II and III levels, and the newly formed AIAW.

The conclusions to be drawn from this necessarily superficial overview of geographical variations in attitudes toward college sports are that *national solutions to problems are going to be hard to develop in the light of regional differences* and that any study of intercollegiate athletics must take that inevitability into account.

TRENDS: The deliberations of any group concerned with the problems of intercollegiate athletics, like any interpretation of the findings of this inquiry, must take account of present and future circumstances. Present ones are of course the product of the past and a brief but significant recital of developments since 1929 is presented in Bernard Ireland's appendix to this report (see Appendix F). *In financial terms,* although some observers predict some relief, *the economic crunch on higher education can be expected to continue. In educational terms, the diversity of higher institutions and their content coverage*

can be expected to expand and move out from the traditional liberal arts core. In socio-political terms, the interests of legislators, women, and minorities are forcing a reevaluation of the role of intercollegiate athletics. In moral terms, the distinction between amateur and professional is disappearing. In socio-institutional terms, although sports as entertainment can be expected to continue to play an increasingly important role in our society, big-time intercollegiate athletics can be expected to keep on losing ground despite instances of deceptive appearances to the contrary. It is hoped that the recommended national study commission will contribute constructively to influence of that process of change and that its efforts will help avoid the crisis or catastrophe that so many predict for college sports, big-time and low-profile alike.

Although there are of course other circumstances that bear heavily upon the world of intercollegiate athletics, the foregoing trends are perhaps the most important. Although all of them are discussed elsewhere in this report, there are four related sets of observations that provide background essential to the interpretation of the findings of the inquiry.

Sports in Society Today: The first textbook on physical education, Methods in Physical Education and Health for Secondary Schools, by Grayson Daugherty, W.B. Saunders Co., London 1967, consulted at random in the course of the inquiry had as one of the sources listed in the bibliography for its first chapter, Gibbon's Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire. In his first chapter in Madness in Sports (Appleton-Century-Croft, 1967), Arnold Beisner has written, "The United States is the second great nation in history to spend great amounts of

time and resources in elaborately producing spectator sports. The first was Rome during the period of its decline." Because so many observers of the contemporary scene speak of sports as a mirror of the society in which they exist, these references to an earlier culture provide disconcerting food for thought on at least two counts: the importance accorded sports in the United States today and our society's standards of morality.

Evidence of the importance of sports in the United States today abounds. It is generally apparent in newspaper coverage that regularly exceeds that of any other topic, in television programming and the viewing habits of the nation, in the rapid expansion of professional sports, in the public interest in spectaculars like baseball's long-time World Series and football's newer Super Bowl, and in the popularity enjoyed by our big-time sports heroes. In more restricted but no less important terms, it is apparent in the discussions about sports as a means of upward mobility for minorities and the poor, in the attention being given by the women's movement to a call for equal rights in intercollegiate athletics, and in the legislation relating to amateur athletics currently before the Congress. In traditional economic or financial terms, sports have become big business and those in the counterculture counter with the observation that sports have become capitalism's current substitute for religion as the opiate for the masses. In almost any terms these days, sports have become a major interest of our society and most signs point to the likelihood that the level of interest will increase, not diminish, in the years ahead.

Many reasons are advanced for this phenomenon. As already noted,

it is good business to satisfy the public's interest however generated and people are going to have more leisure time to watch sports, not less. Sports provide an opportunity for allegiance and a substitute for war, an outlet for aggression and a last link with the country's violent past, a refuge (albeit a diminishing one) for the male as spectator in a world being infiltrated by women, and an arena where for the most part, as participant, he can still outperform her. For both participant and spectator they provide partial fulfillment of the needs created by the growing amount of leisure time and serve, however vicariously, to preserve the ethic that the physical side of man is important. In a period of social upheaval, sports have provided a familiar anchor to windward in the seas of change and there is little on the horizon to suggest any major change in the weather.

The results of this inquiry suggest that *sports have been playing and may be expected to continue to play an increasingly important role in our society.* Any national study should as one of its first tasks undertake to assess the validity of this prognosis and shape its own conduct and recommendations accordingly.

Intercollegiate Athletics in the World of Sports: While society's love affair with sports has intensified, the attention paid to intercollegiate athletics as entertainment has on the average over the past quarter of a century tended to diminish in relative and possibly in absolute terms as well. Newspaper coverage and attendance figures are down in the face of the growth of television and professional sports. Nearly 50 colleges have dropped football in the past ten years and at least one has given

up its entire varsity athletic program. Only in the nation's smaller cities, free from the competition from a professional franchise, do university football teams still manage to thrive. Yet strangely the professional crowds seem not to have been wholly stolen from the colleges and universities but created as virtually new constituencies. Given then the likelihood that professional sports will continue to expand, experience suggests that *big-time intercollegiate athletics as a whole could continue to lose ground as an object of public attention per se.*

This observation leaves the erroneous impression that the important consideration is that they will be playing a less important role in the world of sports, when in fact its significance lies in the fact that they will be playing a different role. For all but the big-time, big-sport programs little will have changed. For the participant in those programs there may be a shift of arena from center stage to proving ground.

Any national study should therefore attempt to assay the likelihood and rapidity of such a shift and to design its recommendations to be consistent with, to delay, or to assist any resultant deemphasis in intercollegiate athletics as entertainment per se and with an increased emphasis in them as training ground.

The Athletic Procession: David Riesman, the noted Harvard sociologist, speaks of the academic procession in higher education. The thesis underlying the phrase is that higher education proceeds to move forward like a snake with the leadership at the head going through phases of development at one point in time that those successively further back

in the procession will encounter successively later in time under somewhat altered circumstances. This concept was brought very explicitly to mind on at least two occasions during the course of the inquiry. On the first, it was by a comment by a member of the athletic establishment who pointed out that Harvard and Yale and their Ivy League colleagues had been initially responsible for introducing all the evils which are at the root of today's ills: overemphasis, alumni pressure, paid admissions, salaried coaches, recruiting and subsidy of athletes. The second occasion was when a representative of one of the major athletic conferences spoke of its leadership role in the college sports scene and its need to set an example for others to follow.

While discussion of Riesman's thesis in connection with intercollegiate sports is dangerous because there can be little subjective agreement as to which institutions or conferences are leading and which are following, theoretical contemplation of it not only provides some clues as to where the enterprise may be heading, but also suggests some opportunities for leadership. In the latter regard, there is no doubt, for instance, that if the five or six major conferences were to agree on a particular course of action and to follow it, everybody else would soon follow suit. Because of the wide variation in regional, conference and institutional patterns noted elsewhere in this report, such an event is unlikely to occur without the intervention of some external force or agency. A national study commission or committee could conceivably serve as such a catalyst.

Applying the Riesman thesis and taking account of regional differences, some forecasts can be formulated as a basis for discussion of the directions

that intercollegiate athletics may be taking in the mid-1970s. If, for instance, one tends to be Eastern and independent in outlook and assumes that the Ivy League is leading the way even in college sports, a national deemphasis is indeed coming. There is in fact disconcerting evidence beginning to surface to this effect elsewhere in the country. For example, the athletic department which sponsors one of the nation's perennial leading football programs is going to have to resort to fund-raising for the first time to balance its budget next year. One of the reasons given is empty seats in the stadium.

If one takes a mid-west outlook and is a follower of Big 10 fortunes, there is disconcerting news that at least two of the athletic programs are in serious financial trouble and that some quarters on the West Coast are calling for dissolution of the Rose Bowl pact between the PAC 8 and the Big 10 on the grounds that the quality of the latter's overall competition, as well as that of the PAC 8, is deteriorating. Underlying that change is the belief on the part of some that athletic programs are being downgraded in order to preserve and strengthen academic quality.

In the other major conferences which are currently proving more successful in terms of national ranking and post-season competition, the emphasis is on expanding institutional intercollegiate sports offerings in the interests of developing more well-rounded and hence more prestigious athletic programs. Members of conferences aspiring to become or having nearly become major appear on the other hand to put emphasis on successful big-time programs in a limited number of sports. The equating of quality with well-roundedness was apparent in the action of the leadership at the 1974 NCAA Convention in calling for a requirement that Division I

institutions sponsor at least eight intercollegiate sports. The desire of the majority of members to concentrate first on the development of their big-time sports was evident in their defeat of the idea.

If one reverses this progression and goes back a little further in time, one thread in the historical development of big-time intercollegiate sports can be observed. First and most classically, the development of a major football program. Next, use of net receipts from it to support physical education and intramural sports, with elements of the latter being transformed into extramural (or club) sports and then into an expanded formal intercollegiate athletic program. Then, as net receipts declined, a dropping of fiscal responsibility for physical education and intra- as well as extra-mural sports. The latter day pattern, developed when the leaders of an earlier era were back to a well-rounded intercollegiate program, finds net receipts from football and (now) basketball, once properly developed, used to expand the menu of intercollegiate offerings. Meanwhile, however, up at the head of the procession, a gradual de-emphasis of the big-time sports is occurring and, while the non-revenue-producing sports are being maintained, their future seems in some doubt.

The process of evolution is a slow one and current conditions may well cause the "athletic procession" to take some peculiar twists and turns. Complicating the traditional pressures to deemphasize or to achieve well-roundedness or to build up a big-time image are such current factors as the economic crunch, the growth of professional sports, and the demands of women. Indeed, there are those in the women's movement who suggest that they could well be the ones to lead the athletic procession

out of the wilderness. In any event, in any national study of intercollegiate athletics, account will have to be carefully taken of the fact that *colleges and universities are not all at the same stage of development in the evolution of their athletic programs* -- and such recommendations as may be developed by the study committee or commission will have similarly to recognize this further aspect of the diversity of American higher education.

Amateur versus Professional: One of the frustrations for any student of sports in the United States today is that of finding the line of demarcation between amateur-ism and professional-ism. Another is that of deciding whether the distinction makes any difference anyway. Consider some of these anomalies. For purposes of intercollegiate competition, a professional in one sport was until last January considered a professional in all sports. At that time the rules were changed and now a professional in one sport is an amateur in all others, at least in college competition. It is unlikely, however, that he or she will be allowed to participate in international events. For years it was impossible for amateurs to compete with professionals in tennis but acceptable in golf. Now it is possible in both. An amateur is someone who presumably doesn't get paid for playing; yet what else but a payment for services rendered is a grant-in-aid awarded without reference to need?

Amateurism in its purist form disappeared years ago. It existed when individuals played games for fun, paid their own expenses, and were coached by amateurs. In 1929 the definition of amateurism was still

clear and unequivocal and it made sense to call for a return to a condition that could be both described and achieved. But events were moving college sports in another direction. Those events included the democratization of secondary and then higher education in the United States. Amateur athletics, at the turn of the century at least, were still very much the privilege of the upper class. Not strangely, however, athletic talent was found to exist in the middle and lower classes as well; and opportunities were arranged to make it available to college sports programs, for a price. The response to the charges of such practices made in the 1929 report was, however, not to outlaw all professionalism but to legitimize certain aspects of it. Thus, *today the definition of amateurism must be couched in degrees of non-professionalism. However described, the concept remains not only an elusive but a controversial one* in an era characterized by the predominance of big-time professional sports. The erstwhile coal mining sons of Pennsylvania and their modern counterparts from the black ghettos of urban American or the ice rinks of Canada can well ask whether amateurism, a privilege of the well-to-do, is consistent with the principle of equality of opportunity. And so might a Commission on Intercollegiate Sports.

INDIVIDUAL ATTITUDES

The course of events in intercollegiate athletics is reflected in the attitudes of the individual parties-at-interest toward them and is in turn shaped by them. This section deals with those attitudes as they emerged in the course of the inquiry. By and large, they are impressionistic rather than data-based and one of the early tasks of the recommended study commission should be to probe the validity of those findings made in the inquiry which it deems important to its effort. They are organized for presentation in six major groupings: the individuals closely affiliated with local higher education and secondary school communities, minorities, women, observers representing the counterculture, and the public.

EDUCATIONAL COMMUNITIES: If the problems that beset intercollegiate athletics are going to be solved by the higher education community without outside intervention, the solutions to them will have to take particular account of the attitudes and interests of the parties-at-interest that comprise it. Although it might be argued that state legislatures represent a party directly at interest, the following analysis assumes their association to be more closely linked to the public interest. It deals first therefore with trustee attitudes and then proceeds to cover those of presidents, faculties, students, athletic directors, coaches, alumni, and parents.

Trustee Attitudes: While boards of trustees tend to concentrate their attention on the financial management of their institutions and to leave

their operation to the administration, they are concerned with broad policy matters. One such matter is the role of intercollegiate athletics and trustees are sometimes blamed for not only tolerating but also fostering the commercialism that infects big-time intercollegiate athletics. While it is true that there are a few overzealous trustees who put the interests of the athletic department above all others, it is generally true that whatever attitudes the members of any given board collectively hold about the role of college sports, they are most likely ones that evolved under earlier boards and are being supported by the current administration. In this and other similar regards, *trustees tend not to be agents of change*, yet it will be important for the recommended national study commission to gain the attention of boards of trustees and to develop its suggestions for reform in terms that will make sense and appeal to them.

Presidential Attitudes: The charge is frequently made that college presidents are ignoring intercollegiate athletics. Indeed it has been made with astonishing regularity ever since the 1929 Carnegie report called upon them then to seize the reins and straighten things out. "If there is trouble abroad in intercollegiate sports," the argument went, "college presidents have it within their power to take corrective action." That *recent generations of college presidents have continued generally to ignore the responsibility for the ethical conduct of college sports which an earlier generation abdicated* is a function of a variety of complex factors. The fact that many of them

are continuing to do so has been confirmed in the course of this inquiry by the observation that most college presidents with whom contact was made, while recognizing that wicked practices were occurring on some other campuses and admitting that they may in the past have occurred on theirs, assert that things are under control at their institutions now.

It is in fact *a new configuration of problems* which *has redirected presidential attention toward intercollegiate athletics* in recent months. The initial impetus has been financial, in part as a function of the general economic crunch besetting higher education and in part as a function of the set of complex issues relating to *the financing of intercollegiate sports*. In this latter regard, presidents generally observe rising operating costs and those with big-time programs fear that they will be unable, in the face of competition from *professional sports*, *television*, and other forms of entertainment, to raise ticket prices fast enough to keep up with expenses. Increasing tuition charges, particularly at private institutions, are adding to *grant-in-aid costs*. The *women's demands* for equal rights constitute a new and heavy demand on already limited funds available for college athletics. And, because financial success in the big-time is so dependent on *winning*, *recruiting* with all its attendant difficulties is intensified, thus adding to the moral and ethical excesses which have formed the other (than financial), continuing major reason for the call for this inquiry.

Unclear, however, with regard to presidential attitudes toward intercollegiate athletics is the extent to which their still widespread lack of apparent concern for the charges of unethical practices in college sports is due either to inadvertence in the face of other, more

pressing problems or to studied neglect of a sometimes messy situation. Some of the most visibly shocked people have been the chief executive officers of those institutions which have been found guilty of infractions of NCAA rules. Their statements to the effect that they had no idea of what was going on on their own campuses have the ring of truth to them, a ring of truth which carries with it the implication of inattention. One university president, for instance, insisted that his football coach should receive special plaudits for his success because he achieved it with far fewer pre-professional aspirants than his conference rivals. In the 1974 football draft that squad had one of the highest number of players selected.

In any event, the general impression gained in the course of the inquiry is that the majority of presidents of big-time sports institutions tend to avoid paying direct attention to athletics by assigning responsibility and authority to oversee them to someone else with the instruction that they want a clean operation. More often than not a college president will use as a convenient excuse for inattention an advisory (to him and the athletic director) committee (composed variously of faculty, students, and alumni) with an outward semblance of authority but no real clout. As noted above, presidents are generally aware of troubles on other campuses, often fearful that there may be problems on their own, and usually reluctant to stir them up in the hope that they will never surface.

As for the attitudes of the sports establishment toward presidential attitudes toward it, athletic directors and coaches are of three minds. One group doesn't think about the problem at all. Another admits that all is not well, points out that presidents are ultimately responsible

and could take things into their own hands if they wanted to, and suggests that if the presidents are as upset as some of them sound they ought to take over. The third group argues to the contrary that presidents don't know the first thing about the complicated business of intercollegiate athletics and would be wise to continue to keep from getting mixed up in them.

The results of the inquiry suggest that *there are problems of sufficient magnitude to warrant the special attention of college and university presidents at this time* and that any national study of intercollegiate athletics should be organized in such a way as to produce results, in process and in the end, which would engage the serious attention of the chief executive officers of the nation's higher institutions.

Admissions and Financial Aid Officer Attitudes: Directors of admissions and of financial aid in institutions having low-profile programs tend not to have any distinctive attitudes toward intercollegiate athletics. The coaches may turn up prospects through their own recruiting efforts and the admissions and financial aid types are as aware as anybody on campus of the need to have not only good students but good musicians and good debaters and good athletes. They are not particularly concerned because they make the decisions as to which ones get in and get aid.

The results of the inquiry suggest that the situation is different in the big-time. Although lip service is sometimes paid through the appropriate shop, the fact is that the athletic department usually handles the admission of and financial aid to the student-athletes, sometimes on completely different academic standards, always on different aid formulae,

and most of the time on a different time schedule. Directors of admissions and financial aid naturally find this disconcerting. They profess to envy their low-profile bretheren, although one is inclined to wonder if they really want the responsibility so long as their institutions remain in the big-time. (Springer's paper, Appendix I, speaks to this issue in the cases of institutions that have given up football.)

Faculty Attitudes: It is patently dangerous to attempt to characterize college and university faculty attitudes toward any subject, and particularly so when the subject is something as complex as intercollegiate athletics. Nevertheless, it would simplistically appear that there are today four rather obvious general groupings: those who support, those who attack, those who are uninterested, and a sizeable silent majority whose attitudes necessarily remain a mystery. However, a look ahead suggests that this condition may not persist.

The widely held belief that most professors currently hold sports in low esteem was not confirmed in the course of the inquiry. Rather, it would appear that *most faculty members, unless forced to do so, do not think about intercollegiate athletics at all.* This is not to say that they are not aware of them at all. They are aware; they just do not appear to consider them worthy of much attention -- an observation which in itself is not unimportant since faculty in-put is sought in the administration of most intercollegiate athletic programs. Such in-put is normally achieved through the appointment of faculty members to athletic committees. The charges are made, however, either that appointees to such bodies are chosen by the president, frequently at the

recommendation of the athletic director, from that relatively small group of professors who already are sympathetic to their institution's sports program -- or that initially uninterested appointees soon succumb to the tender loving care of the athletic department.

More vocal than those who support athletics are those faculty members who are openly unsympathetic. Athletics became, during the period of campus unrest in the late 1960s and early 1970s, closely and clearly identified with tradition and with the establishment. Perceived as such, they became subject to the general criticism that was being made of higher education and one of the specific targets of attack on the part of those who sought to reform it. The vigor of that reform movement has now subsided but much has changed in higher education as a result of it. Least affected, outwardly that is, would appear to be the area of intercollegiate athletics. It is true that the minorities have successfully made their point and the women are now making their's. And it is noted that many younger members of today's higher education faculties were participants in the movement for change. Nevertheless, the disaffection that surfaced during the period of unrest had its roots generally in complaints which existed before and exist now.

The reasons for this continuing disaffection vary. Some faculty members are accused of being jealous of the public attention given to college sports, of the higher salaries reportedly paid to coaches, and ironically, in view of the perception of presidential attitudes noted elsewhere in this report, of the diversion of administrative attention to the problems of intercollegiate athletics. Others complain about lower academic standards applied to student athletes in the admissions

process or about the disproportionate amount of financial aid awarded to players on varsity teams. Others resent the special treatment sought by coaching staffs for their squad members in the matter of tutoring for class periods missed or examinations that have to be made up because of travel schedules. (For another aspect of faculty disinterest see the section below on "Scholarly Inattention.")

In an historical perspective, faculty disinterest is nothing new. The turn-of-the-century era of faculty control of athletics, which followed upon the periods of student and then alumni domination, was not a successful one and policy determination passed into the hands of the administration. Until recently, little has happened to reengage faculty attention. Changing economic conditions, however, give promise of doing so.

If the general economic crunch in higher education continues as expected and if rising net costs compel athletic departments supporting big-time programs to seek general support as predicted, that support will have to come from the already limited funds available to higher education. Such a move will put the sports enterprise into direct competition with academic departments for the dollars available. At that point faculty attention will most certainly be reengaged, not only at first at institutions supporting big-time sports programs but subsequently by faculties at other colleges and universities whose interest would be aroused by the controversy. It is to be hoped that one of the outcomes of a national study of intercollegiate athletics would be to lay out the issues regarding the relationship of intercollegiate athletics to higher education for which each institution

should seek to find its own unique solution.

Student Attitudes: Student attitudes toward intercollegiate athletics were cited as one of the major concerns underlying the 1972 AAU resolution calling for this inquiry. The concern on the part of those presenting the resolution appears to have been based on an assumed continuation of the attitudes prevalent in the late 1960s when undergraduates were becoming increasingly disenchanted with big-time college sports. Their disenchantment was apparent in their disdain for jocks who were perceived as tools of the establishment, in their non-attendance at games, in their protests over the use of required fees to support sports they could not or did not care to watch, and in their general failure to rally round the team in the name of school spirit.

It would today, however, be shortsighted to assume that this attitude will persist or intensify. Indeed the evidence turned up in the course of the inquiry leads to the conclusion that just the opposite may well be happening and will continue to do so for a while. At least one study suggests that student disenchantment with intercollegiate sports was never as widespread as was generally believed and that the vision of it was the product of a vocal minority. In that survey of student interest in intercollegiate athletics made in 1971, 43% of the students questioned opined that it was declining but 47% believed that it was increasing. And the latter figure was considerably higher in all sections of the country except the Northeast, where 57% reported a decline. On virtually every campus visited *there is a growing interest in participation in sports on the part of undergraduates*. It is an

interest which many associate with the ecology issue, the question of man's place in nature, and a reawakened interest in the physical side of man. Through this process many students are identifying again with athletes and attending sports events as a result. The burgeoning of intramural athletics is also seen by some as a manifestation of the growing privatism of our society, doing one's own physical "thing" by choice rather than because of a physical education requirement. And as one long-time observer of the sports scene pointed out, "Where better to lose one's identity than in a sports crowd, where one can, if he wants, laugh at the antics of the establishment?" But whatever the reason *student attendance at intercollegiate events is up on a number of campuses.* And this year's senior class in the nation's high schools is described as being one of the "squarest" to come along since the 1950s. They are more traditional in thought and appearance. It could well be that their attitudes toward intercollegiate sports will follow suit.

Whatever the attitudes on any given campus may be, they will represent an important aspect of the college sports scene, for they will affect not only gate receipts, but also the disposition of student-controlled fees for the support of intercollegiate and intramural sports. Thus, any national study of intercollegiate athletics should test the validity of the tentative findings of the inquiry and take student attitudes carefully into account in the development of any recommendations dealing with the problems of intercollegiate athletics.

Athlete Attitudes: The attitudes of athletes involved in intercollegiate sports are generally favorable toward them. The majority of them are

of course involved in low-profile, non-revenue-producing sports and only a very small number of them are receiving financial aid based on their athletic ability. Such negativism as has been expressed comes essentially from three sources: male athletes who have become disillusioned with what they consider their exploitation in the interests of big-time sports, minority (primarily black) athletes who feel that they have been subjected to even more severe exploitation, and women who believe that they have been discriminated against in their intercollegiate athletic programs. The concerns of the latter two groups are discussed in separate sections of this report. The positive attitude of the generality of athletes appears to reflect their satisfaction with their play experience in an education setting; such opposing negativism as does exist appears to reflect dissatisfaction with working conditions in a commercial setting. The conclusions drawn from these observations are that, except for the three subgroups noted, *intercollegiate athletics provide an important and satisfying experience for participants that should be preserved*, that *the concerns of the disillusioned, the blacks, and women should not be solved by the abolition of college sports*, and that one of the primary goals for a national study commission should be to accommodate the concerns of the three groups in developing its recommendations for change.

Professional Attitudes: Not surprisingly *the attitudes of athletic directors and coaches are generally favorable toward but differentially optimistic about intercollegiate athletics*, although questions in the press might occasionally lead one to think otherwise. That they are

positively inclined toward the values of the field to which their professional lives are dedicated is not surprising. It is their attitudes toward the future that deserve attention here.

Athletic directors are variably concerned about finances. In the big-time, there is concern about both income and expense. A small group of directors of successful programs believe that effective and imaginative management will make it possible to continue financially self-supporting, well-rounded intercollegiate sports programs. They believe that hard-headed business men can make a go of it even if tired out football coaches cannot. Others are concerned about the continued ability of the revenue-producing sports to support a broad offering of non-revenue-producing ones. In the low-profile programs, rising costs are the primary concern and athletic directors are worried about continuing in competition with the academic and other departments of their institutions to get their share of limited dollars; as one veteran athletic director put it, "In a contest for funds, jockstraps will lose out to test tubes every time." In both settings, athletic directors are becoming acutely aware of the added expenses that will be necessary to deal with the demands of women for more equitable treatment. The recommended study of intercollegiate athletics, in its attention to the relationship of college sports to the higher education process, could serve to help the causes not only of the low-profile program directors but also of those big-time ones who see a separation of the revenue-producing and non-revenue-producing sports.

Among college coaches and athletic directors there is a small but growing number of individuals who are openly concerned about the excesses

which have developed in the recruiting and subsidy of student athletes. Ironically, the criticism is coming primarily from coaches in big-time programs and from athletic directors of low-profile ones. While most coaches and athletic directors indicate that they do not see the need for a national study (although all appear ready to cooperate with one), the reasoning and eloquence of the concerned minority contributed measurably to the finding of the inquiry that such an effort is needed, if only to deal with the ethical problems involved.

In summary, taken as a whole, the attitudes of the professionals responsible for the conduct of college sports appear to support the need for a study effort which will deal with the financial, educational, and moral complexities of intercollegiate athletics today.

Alumni Attitudes: Alumni are held by many to be the root of all evil in intercollegiate athletics. They are said to be primarily responsible for the unhealthy pressure for victory, for overzealous recruiting, for under-the-table favors to athletes, for threatening to withhold their largess that holds up the athletic department, for the hiring and firing of coaches, and for the firing of a president if they happen to think he is getting in the way of a coach they like. Such practices exist but they appear to be characteristic of an important, vocal, but very small minority of generally older alumni. (More recent graduates at most colleges tend not to take their intercollegiate sports quite so seriously.)

Because independent colleges depend heavily on general financial support from alumni, their role tends to assume somewhat greater importance than that of graduates of public institutions, which depend heavily

upon legislative appropriations. (It would appear that alumni dollar support of athletic programs per se is equally important to public and private institutions alike but the issue here is general support.) As documented in Springer's report (Appendix I), it appears that private colleges that have deemphasized or abondoned football have not seriously suffered from loss of alumni financial support. At the same time, however, institutions have used the recruiting of students, and student athletes in particular, as a means of maintaining a nucleus of alumni interest which is not to be discounted in maintaining the ties of former students to their alma maters. In any event, one hypothesis to be explored in a major study would be that *alumni support for intercollegiate athletics may not be as widespread or as strong as a vocal minority would have it appear -- or as college presidents seem to fear.*

Take the case of football crowds, for instance. As noted elsewhere in this report, there is no city in the United States, except for Los Angeles, which houses both a financial self-supporting college athletic program and a professional football team. In those other cities where big-time college football does co-exist with a professional franchise, it is all too easy to assume that the former's inability to attract capacity crowds is attributable to the defection of its former fans to the play-for-pay ranks. However, the impression gathered in the course of this inquiry is that pro followings have by and large been created new, not stolen from the colleges. If this observation is in fact the case, the question then surfaces as to what has happened to the erstwhile college fans.

Before the post-World War II encroachment of professional sports, the large college football crowds were composed essentially of students and other members of the institutional community, alumni, and the general public. It would seem reasonable to assume that the first element to defect was the general public. With smaller student and faculty attendance resulting from the protest era of the late 1960s also noted, alumni interest takes on added importance. If the maintenance of alumni loyalty is perceived as a major reason for sponsoring football, one would expect, particularly at independent institutions, that crowds at small-time football games have remained the same. Apparently they haven't and alumni, as well as the general public, have turned their entertainment attention elsewhere. A few individuals have in fact transferred their allegiance in terms of actual attendance to professional sports. Others, given an interest in football but a willingness to devote only one afternoon of a weekend, spend Saturday or Sunday afternoon before the home tube instead of Saturday afternoon at the college field. And the growing interest in sports participation has attracted still others to the golf course or tennis court as participant in preference to the gridiron as spectator. Whatever the reasons, they are important to understand as one ponders the future of intercollegiate athletics and the question of alumni attitudes toward college sports might well be the subject of special investigation in any national study of the field.

Parental Attitudes: The only context in which the attitudes or interests of parents surfaced as a matter of concern during the course of the inquiry was in discussions of the recruiting process. Secondary school

and college personnel alike note increasing pressure from parents of athletically talented young men designed to see that their children are given appropriate exposure to college scouts. For instance, in the case of football they seek to have their offspring play the visible or prestige positions (quarterback, back, end) rather than to be hidden in the middle of the line. College recruiters also observe that many parents treat their children as saleable merchandise, attempting in effect to auction them off to the highest bidder. *Whether such parents are victims of or contributors to the growing commercialism in intercollegiate sports, their attitudes bespeak the need for change.*

SECONDARY SCHOOL ATTITUDES: Secondary schools affect and are affected by intercollegiate athletics in a variety of ways.

In one sense they are to intercollegiate athletics what the latter are to professional sports -- and they have been in the business of supplying athletes longer. Up to World War I, in the era of football dominance by the prestige private institutions in the East, many private schools recruited "fifth year students" not only for the benefit of the schools' won-lost record but also in the interests of providing athletic proving grounds for the colleges which they fed. The prep schools which regularly and openly, to use more modern jargon, red-shirted players for the service academics were a classic case in point well into the post-World War II era. Between the two world wars, new sources were developed, such as the coal mining areas of Pennsylvania and the industrial cities of northeastern Ohio. Then the arrival of the jet age made recruiting on a national basis possible. Some geographical

concentrations of talent still exist of course, but the point is that *intercollegiate athletics now directly affect any secondary school where athletes of promise are enrolled.*

At the same time developments at the secondary level have had their effects as well. In particular the evolution and growth of the large consolidated high school has tended to limit the opportunity for latent talent, "late-bloomers" as they are called in college admissions, to develop. The chances for getting on the squad in the first place are simply better in small schools and, even if a marginally talented athlete makes the squad in a big one, that squad is going to be larger and the concentration of the coaches on the first team is going to get in the way of his chances of moving up. But of course the most pronounced effect is upon the more talented athletes. (Other students are apparently not upset by or indeed curious about all the fuss that the sports heroes generate; they expect it and seem to take for granted that the adults have blown the whole thing out of reasonable proportion.) From the point of view of teachers and administrators the most serious effect on the athletes is interference with their education: their absence from class to meet visiting recruiters, or to go on college-sponsored trips to visit campuses; their distraction from homework by college representatives coming to their houses. One large city high school counselor reported that after winning the state basketball championship, "the team virtually dropped out of school" to deal with the recruiting pressure placed upon them. The extent of this pressure is of course directly correlated with the quality of talent and is, as noted earlier, more pronounced in basketball than in football.

Furthermore, the effects are not confined to high school seniors; the complaint of one secondary school official to the effect that some students having been approached as sophomores, tended to pay little attention to their high school coaches.

Teachers, counselors, administrators, and athletic department personnel find themselves directly affected as well. Reports abound in the public record and in the NCAA files of school principals, registrars, and teachers who have been pressured to alter grades or transcripts so that athletes who would not otherwise qualify for admission can "have the privilege" of going to college. And from the other side, as noted just above, coaches are under pressure from parents to have their athletic offsprings play the eye-catching positions. Guidance counselors, on the other hand, frequently complain that they are by-passed as far as the top athletes are concerned and suggest that the coaches who assume the college counseling function for their players are not trained for the task. Some observers even suggest that the latter are indeed improperly motivated in undertaking it. While there is little evidence that high school coaches receive remuneration or other recognition for having steered stars in certain collegiate directions, they do of course, as guidance counselors do, have certain institutions with which they have developed special rapport and about which they feel secure in referring athletes. At the same time, however, coaches are under more subtle pressures from intercollegiate athletics. Because high school coaching can be a stepping stone to the college ranks if one is successful, there is tremendous pressure to win. And because one is measured by the quality of his workmanship, there is evidence that some

secondary school coaches do in fact put their own career self-interest ahead of their students' in aiming their better players for prestige, big-time colleges on a "full-ride" or grant-in-aid basis. If the lad doesn't make it, that's out of the coach's hands.

The emergence of the consolidated high school was of course not the only development that affected the relationship of intercollegiate athletics to secondary education. As discussed later in this report in connection with physical education, increased specialization and sophistication in training for secondary-school-administration and for coaching-and-physical-education is bringing swiftly to an end the era of the high school coach-turned-principal and causing a separation of sport from educational process that carries over to higher education and there poses one of the most serious questions facing intercollegiate athletics today: its relationship to the higher education process. And here too, at the secondary level can be seen the disappearance of the all-purpose coach, the individual who provided an integration of the big-time and low-profile sports simply because he "taught" both.

The effect of secondary education on intercollegiate athletics can be seen in other ways as well. College football and basketball are big-time in part because that is what they are in secondary school and students bring their attitudes toward those sports with them to college. No wonder either that the student from the small town where high school sports events are "the only show in town," the only reasonably proficient live entertainment to which he and his parents have been regularly exposed, is more likely to go to the stadium than the little theatre. In a not-so-facetious comment, one observer noted

that the legitimate theatre would not be in trouble in America if it could somehow sponsor a "little theatre league," a comment which leads to the final point about secondary schools in relationship to college sports.

The attitude of the nation's schools toward athletics affects and is affected by the attitudes of the communities in which they exist. If as noted earlier there is diversity among the nation's more than 2500 higher institutions, there are even greater differences among our more than 25,000 schools, differences which make generalizations both difficult and dangerous. Yet the fact remains that some of these schools exist in communities which sponsor little league programs which, with all their benefits and faults, serve to demonstrate to youngsters the importance that adults attach to the world of sports -- and in communities out of which comes the win-at-any-cost philosophy which infected the last Soap Box Derby -- the same philosophy which has been at the root of so many of the problems of intercollegiate athletics over so many years.

It is obvious in any event that *any effort to study intercollegiate athletics will have to take specifically into account not only the interests of the nation's secondary schools but also the influences they exert upon the conduct of college sports.*

MINORITIES: The concerns of the Black community over the treatment of its brothers and sisters in connection with intercollegiate athletics are well-documented in the literature and in the press. They are summarized as follows in the "summary of findings" of Roscoe Brown's

paper "Race, Sport, and Academe - the Report of the Task Force on the Black Athlete" which appears as Appendix D: "Specifically, the Task Force finds that *there is considerable evidence, both of an informal and formal nature, which reflects discrimination and unequal treatment in athletics*. Among these concerns are such things as: inadequate educational programs, lack of tutoring, failure of Black athletes to receive degrees in similar proportion to their white counterparts, inequitable treatment concerning financial aid, summer jobs, and jobs for wives, position stacking, playing quotas, social isolation, limitations on dress, political expression, and dating practice, lack of Black coaches and Black officials, limited opportunities for Black women athletes and concern for the breadth and scope of athletic programs in Black colleges." Appendix D should be read in its entirety!

To the white ear that has been tuned in to developments on the athletic scene over the last several years these charges have a familiar but disconcerting ring; "familiar" because they have been heard since well before the Mexico City Olympics of 1968 but "disconcerting" because one likes to think that progress has been made. For instance, one only has to look at the football teams from the state universities in the deep South to see that times have changes. Yet here is a group of knowledgeable, primarily Black college and university officials still contending that "racism permeates every segment of college athletics."

In the opinion of many sociologists, including some of the nation's most prominent ones, and other sophisticated observers of the higher education scene, sports have played a leading role in the integration of previously segregated institutions. To support their belief, they

point to the disproportionately large number of Blacks playing on the nation's big-time college and university football and basketball teams. Some Blacks argue, however, that this phenomenon is simply the result of the fact that young whites have many more success models to emulate than the young Blacks, who are exposed through the media primarily to the professional Black superstars in those two sports; there aren't, they note, that many Black soccer or hockey or tennis or golf players in the intercollegiate ranks. And the success models, they go on to point out, aren't as confined to the sports world for the young white as for the young Black; there are for the majority many success models in the worlds of business, science, and the arts of which the ghetto child is simply not aware. Yet the individual who exhorts him or her to break out is the sports star who comes back to coach on the neighborhood playground.

But if the number of minority participants has reached a reasonable level (if not an acceptable level of on-campus treatment), there is still the concern so carefully documented by Dr. Brown and his fellow task force members that Blacks are not adequately represented in the field leadership, office administrative, team coaching, officiating, and media reporting aspects of intercollegiate sports. And there is the special case of Black women athletics within the more general women's campaign for equality of treatment in college sports.

In summary, the findings of the Task Force on the Black Athlete suggest that, much as one would like to believe that his (and her) problems are pretty much behind us, the proposed national study Commission on Intercollegiate Sports will have to take carefully into general

account in its efforts the continuing concerns of the nation's minorities in connection with college athletics and into specific account in planning its overall research effort the particular recommendations for research on the Black athlete made by Dr. Brown and his colleagues -- research which can help with questions like the following: *What is the extent of discrimination against the Black athlete? What are the academic performance and persistence rates of Black athletes? What are the problems faced by the Black woman athlete? Are there enough Black coaches and officials? Are predominantly Black colleges suffering in their competition with other institutions for Black athletes? Are the media playing fair with the Black athlete?*

WOMEN: *The most important and far-reaching recent development on the college sports scene has been the movement to achieve equal treatment for women in the conduct of intercollegiate athletics.* Mary McKeown's paper on "Women in Intercollegiate Athletics" (Appendix H) reports on the findings of her special inquiry in this regard. As suggested in the prefatory note particularly with respect to the appendices dealing also with economics and minorities, it is important that the reader expose him- or her-self to the totality and flavor of the original document. Further, any interpretation by the principal inquirer such as that which follows here is bound by definition to be suspect of male chauvinism. Be that as it may, the situation with respect to the achievement of equal rights for women in intercollegiate sports is an evolving one and could provide an effective contrast against which to gauge the true nature and extent of the problems that men have succeeded

in creating for themselves.

McKeown provides information, on the average and in reference to particular institutions, that suggests some measure of the current inequality of treatment that will have to be overcome if compliance with the provisions of the Educational Amendments Act of 1972 is to be achieved. It "explicitly states that no person shall be excluded (on the basis of sex) from participation in any educational activity carried out by an institution which receives funds from the federal government." Her data suggest that in most institutions an amount roughly equivalent to something between ½% and 3% of the budget for men's intercollegiate athletics, with 2% as a reasonable median estimate, is spent on women's college sports. This is not to say that there are not enlightened coeducational institutions which spend as much as 40% of the total intercollegiate athletic budget on women. It is to say that McKeown's findings coincide with those of the principal inquirer in suggesting that *intercollegiate athletics for women are woefully underfinanced.* Her recital of the history of college sports for women gives some clear evidence of why this is so. Her description of the lengths to which women in charge of college sports and women participating in them have had to go in order to sustain their programs puts the need for remedial action in human as well as financial terms. Her treatment of the changes that are taking place with respect to "the mystique of the woman athlete" and that should be taking place with respect to the status of women in coaching and sports administration add still other dimensions to the forces for change.

While there are few persons who would dispute the propriety of

the women's demands for equality of treatment in intercollegiate sports, there are differences of opinion among women as to how that equality should be achieved. It was the finding of the principal inquirer, for instance, that, while the women generally interested in the movement appeared to be pushing for equality on an integrated basis, the women in charge of college sports and the athletes participating in them have virtually without exception favored the achievement of equal treatment through separate-but-equal programs. McKeown points out another difference of opinion. Partially in response to a recent court action, the Association of Intercollegiate Athletics for Women (AIAW) changed its regulations which precluded participation by athletic scholarship holders in its championship events and "woman may now accept financial aid based on their athletic ability." It is interesting to note that this action was taken despite the fact that, in principle, "most AIAW members oppose athletic financial aid for athletes, men and women athletes alike." On the other hand women athletes themselves applaud the action; they feel they are entitled to the same treatment in this regard as men and appear therefore to resent such foot-dragging as is taking place on principle.

On the matters of equal budgetary treatment and of availability of equal facilities there is no difference of opinion and it is the financial implications of this unanimity of opinion backed by Federal law that "terrifies many directors of intercollegiate athletics." McKeown's discussion of the question, "Where will the money for women's programs come?" should be read in conjunction with Atwell's broader treatment of the subject in Appendix B.

Echoing the need to assure that the problems of men and women in relation to intercollegiate athletics need to be dealt with simultaneously by the proposed *national study* commission, McKeown's paper suggests that that body *should deal with questions relating to the extent of discrimination against women in intercollegiate athletics, the controversies over integrated versus separate-but-equal treatment and over the award of financial aid to athletes, and to the means by which colleges and universities can comply with the requirements of Title IX of the Education Amendments Act of 1972.*

THE COUNTERCULTURE: Early on in the course of the project, when the chief inquirer was attempting to read himself into the literature of sports generally and intercollegiate athletics in particular, it appeared that the popular books fell into two classifications: those that favored the athletic establishment or culture and those that were against the establishment or culture -- that were anti-establishment or counter-culture in outlook. In retrospect and in review near the end of the inquiry, it would appear that there is no single counter-culture as such, that *there is no unified front committed to bringing down the athletic establishment*, and indeed that that establishment is pretty well entrenched and secure.

Nevertheless, the people and the books who question the establishment and its conduct do pose food for very serious thought. There are, for instance, those who question the authoritarian values transmitted by most college sports and who suggest that more democratic approaches would be preferable. Their arguments are similar to those of the student protest

movement which call for the assignment of greater authority and responsibility for the conduct of intercollegiate athletics to the students themselves. There are of course those who decry the exploitation of athletes but they exist within the establishment as well as without. And there are those who perceive spectator sports as a tool of the industrial complex, wielded in such a way as to keep the minds of the masses off the problems of society. Extreme perhaps in many respects, the literature of dissent should not be discounted in any major study of the intercollegiate sports world. It can serve to highlight many of the problems that are today in need of serious attention.

PUBLIC ATTITUDES: The attitudes of the public toward intercollegiate athletics can be perceived in at least five contexts: the public as fan or spectator, the general public-at-large, and the public as represented in the courts, in the several state legislatures, and in the U.S. Congress.

The Public as Fan or Spectator: Despite a moderate but slowly diminishing number of pockets of exception, general public interest in intercollegiate sports appears to be diminishing in scope. Such interest as does exist tends to be focusing more and more on football and basketball. Such interest as continues to thrive is becoming locally concentrated in those pockets of exception which are the small cities having a big-time minority football team and no professional football franchise, and nationally concentrated on the weekly top ten (or twenty) in the two big-time sports and on the post-season basketball championship tournaments and football

bowl games. These developments, aggravated by the growth of professional sports and accelerated by the nature of television programming and press coverage, are having the effect of concentrating collegiate athletic power in a relatively few major institutions. Aspiration to stay in or break into this elite group in the interests of institutional public relations elevates the pressures for commercialism and brings with it the attendant excesses in the recruiting and subsidy of athletes.

The public as spectator is of course the consumer group to which an intercollegiate athletic program must appeal as entertainment if that program is to be self-supporting. *Because the public likes a winner and supports it with its patronage, local fans add still another dimension to the pressure for victory.*

The Public, as in "Public Relations": For reasons which are not entirely clear and which might profitably be probed in the course of the proposed national study of intercollegiate athletics, *prominence in sports is equated in the public mind with academic reputation and prestige* -- or at least it is in the opinion of public relations experts in higher education. Thus, success in sports is seen as helpful in getting the name of the institution before the public, in attracting students, in hiring faculty, and raising money. Certainly most institutions that have tried to upgrade themselves academically in recent years, most of them large and most of them public, have accompanied the effort with new emphases on their sports programs. *Thus* it is that *the larger public*, beyond the potential sports spectators themselves, *also puts the pressure on to win.*

The Courts: Carlos Alvarez concludes his report on the nature of the cases involving intercollegiate athletics (see Appendix A) with this observation. "*Although the present court actions do not as of the present constitute a major threat to the structure of intercollegiate athletics, it is a source of concern which could lead to radical structural changes* if the system does not heed its warnings and adjust to the times. The ability of intercollegiate athletics to do so will depend on farsighted college administrators who understand what the present realities of college athletics are (as differentiated from) what they were twenty years ago."

This judgment is based on a review of the four contexts in which litigation currently exists: First Amendment litigation; suits involving student-athletes and member institutions against the NCAA; cases dealing with injuries in intercollegiate athletics; and sex discrimination in amateur athletics.

The last five years have witnessed the advent of the application of First Amendment rights to athletes, first in relation to high school students and then in relation to student-athletes at institutions of higher learning. Clearly established at this point is the judgment that "student-athletes have protection from abridgement of their First Amendment freedoms." And it is likely that "of special relevance in future years will be the speech and assembly freedoms as student-athletes . . . become more boisterous and concerned about their rights . . ."

"Most frequent litigation (however) . . . has dealt with actions involving the NCAA against its member institutions and student-athletes" and has "largely arisen from attempts by member schools and particularly

student athletes to prevent enforcement of NCAA regulations. There are relatively few cases involving action against members as institutions but a substantial number involving the failure of student-athletes to meet NCAA eligibility requirements. The issue in the latter instances is the representation of the individual in the cases involving him. The courts have held that "his interest in participation in athletics are so substantial that they cannot be impaired without proceedings which comply with the minimum standards of due process." After reviewing a number of such cases Alvarez forecasts that because "student athletes, and to a lesser degree institutions, have been fairly successful in attaining their desired ends through the legal system, further litigation may be expected in the immediate future." He suggests that, if this trend continues, "schools and student athletes will look less toward the NCAA as the final word in matters relating to intercollegiate sports."

The cases involving injuries incurred in connection with intercollegiate achletics have two bases. One involves negligence; the other, workmen's compensation. Because there are relatively few of the former, attention is focussed on the latter. In that regard it should be noted that one state supreme court has "upheld the position that a scholarship athlete, under certain circumstances, meets a requirement and is therefore entitled to benefits under the workmen's compensation act." Note should also be taken of the probability that the changes in financial aid practices with respect to student-athletes to a year-by-year basis (from the earlier custom of awarding a full four-year grant-in-aid) is liable to generate more litigation since "renewal . . . is mostly left up to . . . (individuals who will make the decision on the basis of) . . .

criteria (which) will most likely include and be determined by athletic performance."

Litigation involving sex discrimination in amateur athletics is a relatively new phenomenon but one whose growth is accelerating. While no court cases involving intercollegiate athletics were discovered to have been settled in the course of the inquiry, it was learned that there are a good many cases involving interscholastic athletics whose outcomes may well have implications at the college level. It is unlikely, however, that intercollegiate athletics will be able for long to escape direct involvement. When it occurs, it is likely that the arguments will resemble those at the secondary level -- and that the complainant will have to "demonstrate a substantial interest at stake such as the educational value of competitive athletics, enhancement of personal reputation by participation or the improved instruction of coaching staffs."

In any event, it looks as though *the next few years will be crucial ones in the courts for intercollegiate athletics*. Certainly the proposed Commission on Intercollegiate Sports would be well advised to follow the course of the actions involved; perhaps it might ultimately be able to apply some special wisdom to their resolution.

State Attitudes: Jerry Beasley's paper on "The State Politics of Intercollegiate Athletics" (Appendix C) treats the relationships of intercollegiate athletics to the interests of governors, legislators, and statewide governing boards. In setting the stage he calls attention to the views of some that "athletics are (both) a buffer from the vagaries

of public sentiment (which) tend to focus society's attention on the periphery of the university while enabling controversial work of the faculty to continue (and) a common external focus (which helps distract) from jealousies and altercations . . . within the university."

More usual of course are the views of those who suggest that there is a positive relationship between success in athletics and success in getting appropriations. Beasley notes, however, that there is only "a small and statistically insignificant positive relationship between the two . . . . (that) the impact of winning teams on the financial disposition of legislators is virtually imperceptible." Nevertheless, he suggests that intercollegiate athletics are both "a manipulatable symbol for state politicians" and "a goblet issue" with which they can feel comfortable.

In the first instance, some governors in some states having a single, clearly identifiable, major public university have identified themselves with the intercollegiate athletic enterprise. Beasley cites several examples, among them one involving governors who have lent their prestige to the recruitment of athletes. Legislators on the other hand can be drawn into the field in response to their obligations to local communities which house public higher institutions.

As "a goblet issue," intercollegiate athletics are much easier to understand, and to measure, than are the performances and products of class-room teaching. Because they are understood, they are the most easily used "mirror" of higher education. As a result, he points out, "Until a reliable, comprehensible technology is developed for evaluating outcomes of the instructional process, legislators will have to content

themselves with a focus on the periphery of higher education."

In commenting on "legislative inaction" in regard to intercollegiate athletics, Beasley suggests a number of reasons. One in particular echoed a concern heard several times in the course of the principle inquiry. His point is that institutions are willing "to accede to personal demands of legislators . . . (to keep them from causing trouble) . . . to do relatively minor things which are important to him but unimportant to the university." Free tickets and free membership in booster clubs were instances cited to the principal inquirer with the observation that, while legislators are not permitted to take money from contractors doing business with the state, they are permitted "freebies" which just have to influence their attitudes toward the institutions on whose appropriations they must ultimately vote. A second reason of course is that no state legislature wants to hamper its institutions in interstate competition and hence is perfectly willing to have problems for resolution in other forums such as the U.S. Congress or the national associations like the NCAA.

Penultimately, Beasley predicts new and greater state attention to budgets, by legislators who decry the decline in local relevance (the fact that the rosters of many public university teams are showing "a marked increase in the number of out-of-state players") and by statewide governing boards whose "preoccupation with cost reduction" will inevitably lead them to college sports. The implication of his observation that while "most states have produced what is commonly known as *'a master plan'* for higher education, not one . . . provides for the future of *intercollegiate athletics*" is an important one to

keep in mind. (See also Appendix B.)

Finally he suggests that "the movement to root out discrimination against women in athletics" calls attention to "two significant factors which have to be considered when assessing the future. . . . First, having acquired the right to vote, students have an opportunity to affect political outcomes directly." If equality is not achieved for women in the conduct of college sports, there are routes of political access to the capitol. Second, there is apparently some question as to whether states may for long be able to continue to "yield responsibility for the regulation of intercollegiate athletics to national associations." (For other treatment of this subject see also Alvarez's paper, Appendix A.)

In a sense, *all seems for the moment to be relatively quiet on the state-level front but the likelihood that action may soon break out in response to financial problems or to the demands of students, particularly in the interests of minorities and women, is certainly not to be discounted.*

The U.S. Congress: Joseph Froomkin's provocative paper on "Sports and the Post-Secondary Sector" (see Appendix E) reports in its later sections on the recent deliberations within the House of Representatives and the Senate regarding legislation designed to deal with the problems of amateur sports in general and with the NCAA-AAU feud (see below) in particular. Although the complications are so involved as to make further summary of them impractical here, several points brought out in this part of Dr. Froomkin's paper should be emphasized. First, in stating that

"the federal role in collegiate sports is still to be clarified," he is predicting that there will be federal involvement. A Commission on Intercollegiate Sports could provide one medium for participation by the educational community in the definition of that role.

Second, he notes the very special relevance to the several proposed pieces of legislation of the facts that college-based sports in the United States are managed by professionals, that this concept of the athletic manager is unique to the United States, and that "the professionalization of college sports coaching makes it extremely difficult to integrate our college athletic managers into the amateur-dominated Olympic Committee." Again, a broadly based Commission on Intercollegiate Sports could help in this instance by reason of an advocacy of the interests of the educational community devoid of the self-interest of existing athletic agencies.

Third, although national pride is a motivating force behind the current calls for legislation, it would appear that the initiating concern was for the interests of the individual athlete involved (or barred from involvement) in international competition.

Finally, Froomkin's paper calls for exploration of ways by which college athletics might cooperate with amateur athletics in contexts other than those directly related to Olympic and other international competition, an exploration which could well be made under the aegis of the proposed Commission on Intercollegiate Sports.

The Public in Summary: In reviewing the public attitudes toward intercollegiate athletics as treated in the five preceding subsections, note

might be taken of the fact that in three cases -- those relating to the public as spectator, the public-at-large, and the state legislatures -- the predominant focus is on the public interest in behalf of the non-participant as spectator or consumer or sponsor, while in the other two -- the courts and the Congress -- the emphasis has been more, though not exclusively, on the public interest in the protection of the rights of the participant. This *distinction between spectator interests and participant interests* is an obvious one that *must be kept in mind as one ponders the problems of intercollegiate athletics;* yet, it is one that can often get lost in the discourse. Still, it is an important distinction, for as far as big-time intercollegiate athletics are concerned a major worry is that non-participant interests have come to assume more importance in their conduct than the interests of those for whom the sports are presumably sponsored in the first place -- that professional self-interest, state pride, national reputation, and interest in "the movement" (of Blacks or of women), for example, have come to assume more importance in the conduct of intercollegiate athletics than the interests of the athletes themselves.

COMMERCIALISM, ENTERTAINMENT, AND ETHICS

Three of the major concerns which prompted the call for this inquiry, and which appeared at the outset to have surfaced quite independently, turned out in the course of the inquiry to be inextricably interrelated. They are that intercollegiate athletics have become too commercialized, that big-time college sports have put higher education improperly in the entertainment business, and that the whole enterprise is infected by unethical practices. The interconnections, obvious in retrospect, are that the *commercialism in intercollegiate athletics is a function of being in the entertainment business and* that the *unethical practices are spawned by competition for the entertainment dollar.*

COMMERCIALISM IN INTERCOLLEGIATE ATHLETICS: Concern over commercialism in intercollegiate athletics is nothing new to higher education. It existed before and has existed since the 1929 Carnegie report. It was one of the primary reasons set forth in the call for this inquiry. Ironically, the charge is sometimes levelled by representatives of institutions which have instructed their athletic directors to break even. Indeed most directors of big-time sports programs do not question the instruction; they have for the most part taken the goal of self-sufficiency for granted. Furthermore, the successful ones don't see what the financial fuss is all about.

The fact remains, however, that legislators, college and university trustees, and presidents, not athletic directors and coaches, are

responsible for policy determination and it is against them, when they establish a policy of financial self-support for a program of intercollegiate athletics, that the charges should be levelled. Misdirected charges of commercialism by faculty members also have a hollow ring when one realizes that by reason of their very self-sufficiency, where it still exists, athletics are not making demands on limited general funds. (So also, incidentally, do their expressions of concern about the recruiting of athletes. Recruiting of faculty members can be, and frequently is, a vicious process; and, unlike intercollegiate athletics, there is not even a code of proper behavior.)

But regardless of where the impetus for commercialism comes from, it does exist and does have serious by-products. It puts the athletic department in business as business, in this case in the sports entertainment business with its peculiar (that is, different from the rest of the entertainment world) emphasis on winning. Seasoned athletic directors point out that success is dependent on many factors, but that chief among them is winning, which is in turn a function of team schedules involving "representative" opponents, good coaches, good athletes, and good weather. Because commercial success, a break-even operation, depends so heavily on better-than-break-even records, it is no wonder that athletic departments seek winning coaches and that they in turn go to such lengths to recruit student athletes.

In short, one finding of the inquiry is that *the cries of anguish about the overemphasis on winning, and about the growing commercialism of big-time college sports* of which that overemphasis is a function, *should be directed not at the athletic establishment but at the*

legislators, trustees, and administrators who today demand that intercollegiate athletic departments support themselves. A national study should undertake to test the validity of this finding and to make recommendations about ways in which institutions can either abandon or rationalize their break-even policies.

INTERCOLLEGIATE ATHLETICS AS ENTERTAINMENT: Concern about the role of big-time intercollegiate athletics in the field of entertainment was one of the primary considerations leading to the call for this inquiry. Accordingly, one of the questions raised regularly in the course thereof was "Do colleges and universities have either the need or the responsibility to provide public entertainment through the medium of intercollegiate sports (for instance, the private institution to its alumni or the publicly supported institution to the taxpayers)?" There turns out to be a wide difference of opinion, the implications of which should be the subject of careful scrutiny in a national study.

There is no doubt, however, that *big-time college sports programs are* in fact *in the entertainment business whether they like it or not.* Presidents, athletic directors, coaches, and even faculty athletic representatives speak openly about "competing for the entertainment dollar." Their concern about the inability to raise ticket prices to keep pace with rising costs is rooted in the fear that further increases would force the consumer to find other uses for his limited entertainment dollars and to partake of his college football by television if at all.

It is, however, *on the issue of whether they should be in the business in the first place that opinions differ.* Those who argue

against the proposition do so mainly on the philosophical ground that public entertainment is neither traditionally nor properly a function of higher education, period. Those who support the proposition do so on essentially three grounds. First, like it or not, the institutions have assumed a responsibility which they cannot now abdicate. The second ground is economic. Even though college sports may not pay for themselves, they provide a focus for alumni, taxpayer and legislator attention which has an indirect pay-off in general financial support for the institution. The third argument is philosophical and rests on the logic that colleges and universities have traditionally and properly been providing entertainment of many kinds over the years. They see inconsistency in the logic of those who find lectures, concerts, recitals and plays acceptable but disapprove of football. They find intercollegiate sports, big-time and low-profile, less corrupting on the whole than some other features of higher education. And they call attention to the desirability of an institution's cultivating a variety of constituencies for economic support and that big-time sports in particular attract such support.

Without attempting to labor all the subtleties here, it nevertheless is obvious that, while low-profile football is much closer than big-time programs to these other fields of entertainment provided to the community at large by colleges and universities, the element of having to win or lose does set athletics apart from other forms of entertainment. (Theodore Lowi's paper, Appendix G, contains an interesting commentary on the relationship between sports and the theatre as entertainment forms.)

The inquiry found validity in the arguments of both camps and suggests that the issue for consideration in a national study *is related not to sports entertainment as entertainment but to sports entertainment as big business.*

PROFESSIONAL SPORTS AND THE MEDIA: The commercial success, or lack thereof, of big-time intercollegiate athletics is influenced by the competition from professional sports for the entertainment dollar and by the coverage given to college sports by the media.

Professional Sports: The rapid growth of professional sports since World War II has had a marked effect on intercollegiate athletics. As noted elsewhere, they have siphoned off newspaper interest and concentrated what is left in the big-time, big-college sports of football and basketball. They have created standards of entertainment performance that are different from those at the college level. They have opened up, or at least greatly enlarged, career opportunities. And they have been instrumental in establishing unrealistic success models for many of the nation's minority youth.

Most important in the context of commercialism, however, *professional sports have provided an alternative attraction for the sports entertainment dollar and won.* Except in Los Angeles, there is not a financially successful big-time intercollegiate football program in a city with a professional football franchise. The two Big 10 programs in the deepest financial trouble are the only ones in head-to-head competition with pro teams. As noted elsewhere, it is believed that professional football could drive college football off the air

if it wanted to. But because the colleges provide a training ground for professional players, the pro franchises want to keep what some refer to as their gridiron farm system turning out raw material for their consumption. Recognizing this motivation, some observers of the sports scene are suggesting that ways and means be found for generating professional sport support for college athletics; they see the pro-self-imposed ban on Saturday television as insufficient.

Provision of such support would of course create problems of distribution. Support on a per head basis (for instance, providing to an institution one scholarhip for each athlete who makes a regular season squad) would only intensify the recruiting of high school athletes, itself already a process suspected of excess. Conversely, because not all college football programs produce pros, support across the board to all colleges does not appear to make sense either. Exploration of some middle ground, within the context of a broader search for bases of cooperation, seems called for at this time.

Because colleges and universities' athletic programs were there first, their supporters have tended to perceive professional sports as an intrusion. Certainly their actions in building barriers between professional sports personnel and the collegiate athletic community confirm this attitude. For instance, one of the arguments used in explaining the NCAA rule against allowing colleges and universities to rent their stadium to professional football teams went like this: "We don't allow our players or coaches to associate with the pros. I see no reason why we should deny them the chance and then let the institutions do so." Many in the college sports world act generally

as if they are convinced that the pros are out to ruin intercollegiate athletics.

Conversations with individuals from the professional side in the course of the inquiry would, however, seem to suggest just the opposite. They recognize the college ranks as their source of raw player material. What they may not so clearly recognize is the possibility that colleges may be training their future consumer - spectators as well. As Froomkin points out in Appendix E, "The increasing popularity of basketball and football as spectator sports has never been convincingly linked to the fact that a growing number of persons in our population who have attended or graduated from post-secondary institutions have had increased exposure to those two sports. The hypothesis is extremely attractive, however."

For professional sports then, *particularly football and basketball, it is important that there be strong intercollegiate programs where potential players can be trained and observed and where consumers can be developed.* Given this stake in the success of college sports, professional owners, general managers and coaches appear willing to sit down with athletic and administrative representatives from colleges and universities to work out patterns of cooperation which would lend support to college-level activities. For example, professional franchises oversubscribed for season tickets might give priority to individuals holding season tickets for the local college teams. Sequential showing of college and pro coach television programs could attract attention to the former's teams. Possibilities in terms of financial cooperation (for which read "support") have been noted above. In working with the

press, professional representatives could help by calling explicit attention to intercollegiate competition. In any event a national study could well serve as the medium for *joint exploration by the professional and college-level sports world of* these and other *ways and means by which the former could help support the latter in a much-needed stabilization of the sports entertainment business.*

Television: The advent and growth of television have added new problems and new dimensions to some old ones for the world of intercollegiate athletics. In various ways it exerts very direct control on the conduct of televised athletic events, determining when games shall start and when commercial time-outs will be called. In its choice of days, that is by not televising professional football games on Saturday afternoon and Friday evening and by not showing college games on Friday evening, the medium supports an uneasy truce among interscholastic, intercollegiate and professional football. In this context it is seen also as professional sports' answer to the suggestion that they should contribute dollars to the support of the institutions which screen and train their players. The pros argue that by not competing with the NCAA in the Saturday football market, they are in fact making such a contribution. And they are not only losing the money they could earn from such exposure (experience suggests that in a head-to-head competition with college events the pros would win) but they are also filling the colleges' coffers with those same lost dollars.

But Saturday coverage is a mixed blessing. The televised game may be a more attractive alternative then the hometown college game and,

unless that college is one of the few that does not charge for admission, a less expensive one. On the other hand, the televised game does pump welcome dollars into the support of intercollegiate athletics, some of it generally to support of the services provided through the national athletic associations and conferences, some of it to the other members of the conferences of the participating teams, but the largest share of it usually to the teams on the tube, which got there because they are successful. Television thus adds to the pressure on coaches to produce winning teams.

It has less direct and more subtle influences as well. Some sociologists claim that it engenders a passive consumerism which takes people out of participation, a claim being refuted at least among today's college-age population by their growing interest in intramural and club sports: At the same time, television has served to stimulate the growth of professional sports in the United States and, in doing so, has affected intercollegiate athletics in several ways. Because of the national and sometimes international character of the big-time professional leagues, their events are capable of regularly generating a national interest, a phenomenon on which the colleges can capitalize only briefly in their post-season bowl games and championship tournaments. According to some, the televising of certain sports adds a sophistication to spectatorship which makes the public at large less satisfied with performance at the college level and therefore more likely, given a professional alternative, not so spend its entertinnment dollar on intercollegiate games. Others would hardly call it sophistication in calling attention to college hockey crowds that try to goad

players into fights -- like those that they see on the tube.

Television also serves to influence the popularity of sports. Gymnastics, for instance, received a great boost as a result of the televising of the 1972 Olympics. In the same way, however, it serves to generate interest among boys and girls, young men and women, in the more regularly broadcast sports and thus to perpetuate the importance of the big-time sports as opportunities for both viewing and playing. There are those, for instance, who believe that in their televised appearances, professional black football and basketball stars come through as success models to their younger brethren and thereby help to set unrealistic career goals for a great many of them. And, of course, television has served to focus the attention of the press on professional sports, the collegiate winners, the bowl games, and championship tournaments and to divert it from intercollegiate athletics broadly perceived.

The Press: The effect or influence of the nation's press is variously perceived as negative toward, disinterested in, uninformed about, captive of, and irresponsible toward intercollegiate athletics.

The charges of disinterest and lack of information are made in the light of the emphasis of the major city newspapers on professional sports. Coaches and athletic directors complain that public interest in college sports is dulled and attendance at intercollegiate events diminished because most space on most sports pages is devoted to professional teams. Women complain that what minimal coverage is given to their sports is replete with evidence of male chauvinism. The press

responds of course that it is only giving the public what it wants. These charges are a far cry from those which characterized the 1929 Carnegie report which decried the overemphasis given to the importance of intercollegiate athletics by the nation's press. The fact is that today's press concentrates its attention to college sports on the "top ten."

The charge that press eats out of the hand that feeds it is leveled against sports writers in smaller cities which are the homes of the successful big-time university programs. The arguments here are that close association with an athletic department leads inevitably to familiarity and then to prejudice and that unless the local sports-writer caters to the winning coach, the latter will freeze him out of inside dope. This charge is simllar to that mounted against members of the big city press assigned to cover professional teams.

The charge of irresponsibility is made by newspaper people who are not sportswriters and by others. It is based on the certainty that sportswriters are aware of the dirty tricks that are being played in the recruitment and subsidy of athletes and on the judgement that those writers are abdicating their responsibility to expose. That they fail to do so is attributed to the belief that they would expose a scandal of such major proportions that it would put big-time inter-collegiate athletics and them out of business.

Ironically the charge of negativism is lodged against a growing cadre of mostly younger writers who have taken it upon themselves in the press and in the literature to comment upon intercollegiate athletics, not simply to report them. Spawned in the era of campus protest, they

have called many of the excesses in intercollegiate athletics to public attention but generated little in the way of public response.

The fact remains, however, that press coverage, its lack thereof or its nature, does have an influence on intercollegiate athletics. (And the fact also remains that this section was written before The New York Times series on recruiting in intercollegiate athletics was initiated on March 10, 1974. The contents as well as the fall-out will be interesting to observe.)

Radio: Radio today plays an important though less prominent part than television and the press on the intercollegiate athletics scene. In its news coverage, it is taking the same tack and having the same effect as the press in concentrating national interest on the top teams in the big-time sports. However, in its events coverage it is much more catholic and much less concentrated in its coverage. Because of its relatively low cost as compared with television, it provides an opportunity for local or college stations to broadcast away games back to the home campus and community. At the state level in instances where there are more than one state university, state-wide radio coverage of football and basketball is a prize sought by institutions vieing for public interest and support (for which read "funds"). It is a force not to be overlooked in any study of intercollegiate sports.

COMPETITIVE EXCESSES: External competition from professional sports, selective treatment by the media, pressure from alumni and the public have all combined to put big-time collegiate athletic programs into

competition with each other not only on the playing field but in the market for entertainers/performers/athletes. The need to win on the field has thus led to those ethical problems in the recruiting, financial subsidy, and on-campus care-and-feeding of college athletes which formed one of the basic sets of consideration leading to the call for this inquiry. In the course of the inquiry *no one* has been found who *disputes the existence of such problems; what is at issue is their volume.*

To reduce what could easily become a polemic to a partial listing, violations which come to the attention of the inquiry team include, but are by no means confined to, the following:

- altering high school academic transcripts
- threatening to bomb the home of a high school principal who refused to alter transcripts
- changing admissions test scores
- having substitutes, including assistant coaches, take admissions tests
- offering jobs to parents or other relatives of a prospect
- promising one package of financial aid and delivering another
- firing from a state job the father of a prospect who enrolled at other than that state's university
- "tipping" or otherwise paying athletes who perform particularly well on a given occasion -- and then on subsequent ones
- providing a community college basketball star with a private apartment and a car
- providing a quarterback with a new car every year, his favorite end with a "tip," and the interior lineman with nothing
- getting grades for athletes in courses they never attended
- enrolling university big-time athletes in junior colleges out-of-season and getting them grades there for courses they never attended
- using federal work study funds to pay athletes for questionable or non-existent jobs
- getting a portion of work study funds paid to athletes "kicked back" into the athletic department kitty
- forcing injured players to "get back in the game"

The fact that violations played the same role in generating the studies leading to the 1929 Carnegie report and the 1952 ACE effort and yet persist in more virulent form today suggests a formidable challenge to the national study that must be mounted in order, at least in part, to deal with them.

The existence of such violations is admitted by those involved in intercollegiate sports and documented in press reports and the files of the several national associations and athletic conferences. The admissions, however, never relate to the campus or conference or region of the admittee. It is always another coach, another president's institution, another conference, or another region that is guilty. Conceivably, the alumni or booster club could be doing something unethical but no one in authority "on our campus" is aware of them.

Financial Aid in Intercollegiate Athletics: Perhaps the saddest self-commentary by the athletic establishment about the state of its own morality appears in the controversy surrounding the award of financial aid to athletes. At the 1973 NCAA convention a proposal was presented calling for the abolition of full-ride grants-in-aid and the adoption of a policy calling for the award of financial aid to student athletes on the basis of need. Two reasons among others, were advanced in support of the proposal. One, it is standard practice with respect to virtually all other students. This argument makes good sense, particularly to those who decry special treatment of athletes. In fact, most people in the educational community but outside the athletic establishment are all for it and can't understand

why it is not standard practice in the first place. Two, it saves money. This potential result is attractive to some inside the establishment.

One large, big-time, independent institution visited in the course of the inquiry suggested an experience roughly as follows: Under NCAA regulations it could award $600,000 in athletic grants-in-aid. Because it, like most private institutions, has much higher tuition than its public counterparts, it needs considerably more scholarship money to support a given athlete. By not awarding all the grants-in-aid that it was entitled to and by making some of the awards it did make partial instead of full ones, the institution got by with $400,000. If it had used the formula of the College Scholarship Service for computing need and made its awards on that basis, it would have cost only $200,000.

With two such compelling arguments on its side, why was the proposal rejected? It was turned down in 1973 and again in 1974 because *the big-time intercollegiate athletic establishment on balance doesn't trust itself*. The argument was that such a policy would generate even more under-the-table payments than now exist. Note not only the admission that they now exist but also the opinions that the pressure to win is so great that coaches would exceed the need formula and that athletes would accept such awards. (The qualification relating to "big-time" in the second sentence above is an important one. At the 1974 NCAA convention, the Division III colleges at least voted to go with an aid-according-to-need policy.)

In any event *the issue of grants-in-aid versus aid-based-on-need*

promises to remain a controversial one and one to which the attention of the proposed national study Commission on Intercollegiate Sports might profitably be given.

Medical Concerns: Although problems related to the medical aspects of intercollegiate athletics represented a major concern in the study underlying the 1929 report in the sense that injuries reflected an unethical exploitation of athletes, the topic neither appeared as part of the rationale for the mounting of this inquiry nor surfaced without prompting as a matter of moment during the course thereof. In 1929 the focus was on football injuries. Subsequent advances in medical knowledge, training methods, and protective equipment have tended generally to allay concerns on that score. Meanwhile, a review of the literature and the solicitation of opinion during the course of the inquiry suggest that a new generation of problems has appeared. They include the following charges: That the pressure to win has prompted some athletic staffs to employ newly developed short-term medical treatment (in order to get players back in the game) at the risk of long-term disability. That the use of artificial turf has introduced a set of medically related problems (injuries, burns, infections) which, while different from those incurred on grass, are in the aggregate more severe. That an improper and excessive use of drugs has developed -- particularly of new drugs to build up strength or to add weight.

In the matter of sports-related injuries, prevailing opinion appears, as already noted, to be that advances in medicine, training,

and equipment have served to diminish the incidence of those serious and disabling injuries with which the 1929 report was concerned. Despite the improvements, however, research and experimentation designed to find ways for reducing still further the number and severity of such injuries is continuously in progress.

In the matter of opportunistic use of short-term medical treatment, the charges have most often been initiated by former athletes. They are seldom made or confirmed by the athletic establishment, and then only in the most general terms about someone else's institution. The fact remains, however, that in soliciting opinion with regard to serious problems facing college sports, discussion of this particular subject was not initiated either by institutional staff members or by athletes, past or present. Furthermore, it did not emerge without prompting as one of the factors involved in the exploitation of athletes. (For treatment of the legal issues involving medical problems arising from intercollegiate athletics see Alvarez's report in Appendix A.)

In the matter of medical problems related to the use of artificial turf, there seems to be wide divergence of opinion. Those opposing its use argue that considerations relating to finances (it costs less to maintain) and aesthetics (it looks better on television) have been allowed to override those related to the physical well-being of the athletes. Those favoring its use admit that artificial turf has created its own new brand of injuries but opine that they are on balance less severe than those, particularly knee injuries, suffered on natural turf. And they generally feel that, while its maintenance

costs have turned out to be higher than those associated with grass, the fact that the surface can be used 24 hours a day (while grass must be protected) makes the new surfaces a wise investment.

In the matter of the use of drugs in college sports, the results of the inquiry suggest that, as is happening in the society-at-large, the "drug problem" is on the decline. Those within the athletic establishment generally agree that there was a period of extensive experimentation with certain new drugs a few years back, but believe that that period has to all intents and purposes ended. Nevertheless, it has been recognized as a matter worthy of special continuing consideration by the NCAA and is under study at this time.

In summary, while *the medically related problems of intercollegiate athletics are not generally perceived as constituting a matter of major concern at this time,* they nevertheless appear as a result of this inquiry to be of sufficient importance to warrant specific attention in a national study.

The Incidence of Competitive Excesses: But to return to the main theme of this section, the volume, or more properly the volumetric nature (the numbers, the kinds, and the number of each kind) of unethical practices is subject to wide difference of opinion. The NCAA officials concerned with enforcement report, for instance, that most of the violations reported to them have to do with recruiting (because that is where institutions can keep an eye on each other) but that probably the greater number and certainly the more serious occur in the academic and financial care and feeding of athletes once they are enrolled (and

out from under scrutiny by other institutions). Conference and national association officials point to their files for volumetric data. These sources suggest that the number is relatively small but the investigators admit that there are undoubtedly more violations than are reported to them for review, particularly again of the on-campus variety.

College and university presidents tend to fall into three groups: those who avoid the subject, those who talk about it but are not concerned about the situation, and those who are alarmed. The degree of the latter's alarm is evident in some of the solutions that are proposed, from a dramatically enlarged NCAA investigatory force to the abolition of intercollegiate football, basketball, and hockey. Athletic directors and coaches normally generalize in admitting that unethical practices do exist, but the great majority of those reached in this inquiry indicated that they believe that the number of violations is relatively small. Secondary school personnel echo this same belief.

On the other hand, virtually without exception, the recent college graduates who were interviewed in the course of the inquiry as recent participants in big-time football and basketball charged that violations are flagrant and widespread. They name people, places, and events. They agree with the NCAA observation that more violations probably take place in the care and feeding than in the recruiting of athletes. And they indicate that alumni, boosters, and friends are responsible for most of them. But while they believe that athletic directors and coaches may not know specifically who is doing what for whom, they are strongly of the opinion that the staff has at the very

least to have a general idea of what is going on and was probably responsible for generating the "what" in the first place.

In response to these charges by athletes, coaches and athletic directors point out that their experience suggests that the players, past and present, tend to exaggerate. For instance, when returning former athletes are asked about the incidence of violations that occurred when they were participating they will frequently first make general accusations of a sweeping nature but then back down when questioned about specifics.

While the findings made in the course of this inquiry are obviously not conclusive, there appears to be sufficient evidence to suggest that *the ethical problems relating to the recruiting, subsidy, and on-campus care and feeding of participants in big-time college sports are serious enough, both in kind and in number, to warrant the mounting of a national study of intercollegiate athletics* -- and so to warrant on their own account and without regard to the financial and other problems besetting the field. The principal inquirer believes, however, that those problems cannot be dealt with in isolation - - in isolation either from the commercial, entertainment-related influences which have exacerbated them and which are dealt with above or from the economic and educational considerations which are treated below.

CONTROLLING COMPETITION

The existence of competitive excesses is of course nothing new to intercollegiate athletics. Indeed, they constituted the major impetus for the 1929 Carnegie and the 1952 ACE reports. Education's recourse has been to use athletic associations and conferences as regulatory mechanisms for the control of the collegiate sports entertainment business. Before commenting on their effectiveness in fulfilling that role, one introductory comment needs to be made and explained. *Commercialism is not the only motivation for wanting to win.*

WINNING PER SE: One of the most persistent criticisms of intercollegiate athletics has to do with the emphasis on winning. As noted above, the overemphasis is most often attributed by the critics to institutional commercialization of college sports and the consequent need to win in order to make money. The point must be made, however, that is is not the only cause. Also involved are the individual commerical or professional interests of coaches, particularly younger ones aspiring to advance. Their ambitions affect the programs in which they are laboring at any given moment, small-or big-time alike. And yet those two motivations do not account fully for the emphasis on victory that pervades the college sports scene. Many older coaches of minor sports, secure in their assignments, crave it. Some junior college coaches with tenure in the physical education department, to which they can return full time at any time, recruit like mad in order to build

winning teams. Even the participants want to win. In other words, the commercialism of institutions and the ambitions of individuals are not the only causes of the emphasis on winning in college sports; *even if the commercialism were exorcised, the will to win would undoubtedly still produce excesses, cause institutions to associate in order to make rules to deal with the excesses, and compel coaches, some of them at least, to take liberties with those rules.*

NATIONAL ASSOCIATIONS AND CONFERENCES: Institutions and individuals associate with each other in a variety of organizations concerned with intercollegiate athletics. There are four national and two large regional associations of colleges and universities, plus a number of smaller institutional subgroupings or conferences; and there are a number of national professional associations, one for athletic directors and one each for coaches in a variety of sports. All are concerned with much more than the regulation of intercollegiate athletics -- the institutional associations and conferences with all the aspects of external administration and the professional associations with the provision of services to their members. But all are in varying degree concerned with the regulatory process.

The National Associations of Institutions: The four major national institutional associations are the National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA), the National Association of Intercollegiate Athletics (NAIA), the National Junior College Athletic Association (NJCAA), and the Association of Intercollegiate Athletics for Women (AIAW). The two large regional bodies are the Eastern College Athletic Conference (ECAC),

which acts both as a regional NCAA of sorts and for many of its members as a conference in the more usual sense, and the California Junior College Athletic Association (CJCAA), which represents a major portion of the two-year colleges which do not belong to the NJCAA. Recognizing the unique roles filled by the ECAC and the CJCAA on the national scene in connection with men's athletics and the limited experience of the newly formed AIAW in connection with women's sports, discussion in this section deals with the NCAA, the NAIA, and the NJCAA.

All three provide a variety of services to their members, the NCAA sponsoring the most ambitious. It sponsors or supports information, training, scholarship, research, legislative, and legal services; maintains a film library and keeps official statistics; is responsible for the playing rules in thirteen intercollegiate sports; represents its members in the televising of college games; sponsors post-season tournaments and regulates the competition in them and in bowl games; and enacts legislation to deal nationally with athletic problems, particularly those relating to the recruitment and subsidy of athletes, and maintains an enforcement program to deal with infractions of legislated rules. The NAIA and the NJCAA appear to concentrate more of their associational efforts on post-season tournaments and relatively less on the promulgation and enforcement of rules. The charge is often heard against the NCAA that it similarly expends too much of its effort on post-season championship tournaments and its television program. Because most of the association's income is derived from these two sources, and the lion's share thereof by the tournaments, the observation is not surprising; the funds produced thereby are needed to support all

the other activities of the organization, including its enforcement program. *Incumbent upon those who call for an increase in the enforcement effort* of the NCAA *is the need to suggest where the necessary funds to underwrite it can be found and what other worthy* NCAA *activities should be curtailed.*

Membership statistics for the NCAA are discussed above in the section on "the taxonomy of institutions." The other major national athletic association for men, NAIA, which was founded in 1935 " . . . to champion the cause and promote the interests of the colleges of moderate enrollment and sound athletic philosophy and program," has approximately 565 members, none of whom would qualify as big-time. The membership is divided into 32 Districts which tend to be confined to individual states or groups of adjoining states. As earlier noted, some NAIA institutions also hold membership in Division II or III of NCAA. A cursory examination of membership lists suggests that among ECAC institutions in the Northeast (NCAA Districts I and II), for example, perhaps as many as 10% hold memberships in both NCAA and NAIA. This figure, however, is probably low since NAIA's chief strength appears to be in the South and Midwest.

Athletic Conferences: Intercollegiate athletics have been responsible for the formation of a number of all-purpose institutional groupings designed to deal with common educational programs. For instance, the Ivy League and the Associated Colleges of the Midwest are outgrowths of associations formed initially to deal with athletic problems. The Committee on Institutional Cooperation of the Big 10 and the University,

an agency concerned with cooperative efforts at the graduate level, is an amalgam of the Big 10 before Michigan State was admitted to and after the University of Chicago withdrew from that athletic conference.

The athletic concerns which brought these and other conferences into being had to do with matters such as scheduling, eligibility, and the provision of officials. Many of them have imposed on top of the rules adopted nationally under the aegis of the NCAA, NAIA, and NJCAA more restrictive regulations in connection with the recruiting and subsidy of athletes.

The modus operandi of these *conference groupings* differ with athletic directors, faculty, athletic representatives and presidents differentially involved in their governance structure. By and large, however, they *would appear to provide the setting in which, if a college or university president is going to pay attention to intercollegiate athletics at all, he pays it.* They provide a forum of reasonable size in which chief executives facing similar problems (athletic and otherwise) can effectively get together to discuss common concerns. Because of the presidential interest generally shown in the league context, the several athletic conferences could prove useful as a mechanism for engaging presidential attention toward the issues raised in the recommended study of intercollegiate athletics.

One such issue is explicitly apparent in the complaints voiced by some athletic directors in charge of big-time programs on the unevenness of competition that has developed within certain athletic conferences. The references in the press this past fall to the "Big 2" and the "Little 8" in the Big 10 make a case in point. In a sense, those who

produce winners are the victims of their own successes and their complaint is that the weaker teams are poor drawing cards. Those associated with the losers of course complain that success breeds success and that it is hard to break out of the vicious cycle without resorting to rule-breaking. Yet the latter are often hesitant to get out of the conference because at least they can be assured of one or two reasonably good "gates" when they play the winners. Nevertheless, there is developing some momentum for a realignment of the athletic conferences in ways that would tend more nearly to even out the competition.

It has been observed, for instance, that in general and with occasional notable exceptions, the independent universities playing big-time football usually rank in the bottom half of their conference standings. Consequently, there are those who suggest that perhaps there should be a national conference of these institutions wherein like-minded, like-supported programs could compete. The barriers here of course are the time and costs involved in travel.

Other observers have suggested that neighbor conferences might merge and produce two divisions, one with the perennial winners and the other with the perennial losers -- and possibly with the opportunity for the winner of the lower division to displace the bottom team in the upper division as is done in the British soccer leagues.

The emergence of the have/have-not concept and the subsequent search for solution point up the fact that the *rules and regulations* adopted by institutions, within the NCAA and within the several conferences, *have not* succeeded in accomplishing one of the major objectives they were established to achieve. They have not *evened out*

the competition, even among presumably like-minded institutions. As for the "have-not's" who are contemplating giving up big-time football, Felix Springer's report (Appendix I) suggests that the consequences are not all that traumatic.

The National Associations of Individuals: The national professional associations of coaches and athletic directors are concerned primarily with the training and information exchange services. The coaches' groups generally have developed codes of ethics but little or no attempt is made to deal formally with presumed infractions. The National Association of Collegiate Directors of Athletics has no such code, but there is a nucleus of individuals within the organization who are interested in the possibility of developing a rationale and a mechanism for accrediting athletic departments.

POLICING INTERCOLLEGIATE ATHLETICS: As already noted, there are both moral and competitive reasons for the existence of self-imposed legislation in intercollegiate athletics: to keep people honest and to even out the competition. Public attention tends to focus on the former and one of the criticisms of the NCAA picked up early in the course of the inquiry was to the effect that it does not have a large enough investigatory staff to carry out its enforcement responsibility for keeping college sports honest. The critics complain not only that the staff is so busy reacting to charges of violations formally lodged with the NCAA that it has no opportunity to take an initiative but also that it is not even large enough to follow up adequately on all the complaints that do come in. Discussions of these criticisms during the

subsequent course of the inquiry have brought to light other, related concerns and controversies. The critics of the "jock establishment" suggest, for instance, that the NCAA operation, with the members of the establishment policing themselves, is a farce; and some objective observers, while not as extreme in their reaction, opine that some external investigatory agency, less closely identified with the enterprise in the public eye, might be preferable. The supporters of the NCAA effort counter with the observation that the legal and medical professions, for example, have codes of ethics enforced by the members of them. In turn, other observers point out that some college academic departments, such as chemistry or engineering, are approved both by their faculty peers in the accreditation process and by their respective professional societies, which the NCAA, as an association of institutions and not of individuals, is not.

All policing of intercollegiate sports is of course not done by the NCAA. While they put much less emphasis on the process, the two other national organizations, the NAIA and the NJCAA, do attempt to help in much lower key programs. In both the big-time and low-profile arenas, the many athletic conferences around the country play a significant role, frequently having rules and regulations which, being more stringent or restrictive than the national ones, require local attention. The degree of investigatory responsibility assumed by these groupings and the mechanisms by which they self-regulate themselves vary widely and a commonly heard criticism is that, because the members of a conference are by definition like-minded, there is a tendency to berate each other privately for wicked acts and then sweep it all

under the rug in the interests of public conference harmony. Some observers have suggested as a way around this complaint that the NCAA investigatory staff be beefed up in part to respond to conference calls for external investigations.

In the light of these considerations it would certainly appear that one task of *any national study* effort *should* be to *assess the practices currently being followed in the policing of intercollegiate sports, particularly big-time ones;* to *speak to the adequacy or inadequacy of* the efforts of the NCAA, as well as of the other *national, regional, and conference agencies* involved; and to *make* such *recommendations for improvement* of the process as it may deem appropriate.

ACCREDITATION: If enforcement is the mechanism for insuring that the rules governing the conduct of intercollegiate athletics are observed, accreditation is the self-regulating process by which the institutions which represent the higher education community set and maintain overall standards of quality and performance for the nation's colleges and universities. To get the job done, they have organized themselves into six regional accrediting associations. To do the job, teams of faculty members and administrators are appointed from sister institutions to "visit" (for which read "evaluate") each member of the association on a regularly recurring basis after initial accreditation. Thus, once an institution has achieved accredited status (met the association's standards), the process can be described in a sense as "preventive," designed to encourage institutions to prevent themselves from falling below standard, rather than "corrective," which is, as is noted below, what obtains in the case of college sports.

Although all aspects of a college's or university's operations are presumably subject to review, there is one notable exception to this universality of attention. The regional accreditation associations have abdicated responsibility for sound standards of conduct in intercollegiate athletics and left it to the national athletic associations such as the NCAA and NAIA and to the regional and local athletic conferences such as the ECAC, Big 10, and PAC-8. In the past some of the accrediting associations did formally "visit" athletic departments with suggested guidelines for evaluation. It would appear, however, than even in those days there was little critical review and current informal inquiry has turned up little evidence of any institution ever having been denied accreditation or threatened with withdrawal of accreditation because of shortcomings in its handling of athletics. Today the guidelines are gone and the visit to the athletic department is even more perfunctory. Any related inquiry seems generally to be made in terms of seeing whether goals of the athletic program appear to be consonant with the goals of the institution. Profession of good intentions appears to suffice.

This disinterest on the part of the accrediting acencies, and more particularly on the part of the faculty members and administrators who comprise their visiting teams, would seem to be further evidence of the breakdown in the relationship between athletics and education. "Sports are something different or special or apart and should be treated as such" would seem to be the rationale.

Meanwhile, left to accredit or police itself, the athletic establishment finds itself in a ludicrously complicated situation with

respect to the organization of the regulatory process and in an awkward position with respect to its nature. In the matter of organization there is on most campuses a faculty committee which presumably provides some kind of academic respectability to if not policy control over the athletic department. Often, however, its members are suspect in the eyes of their faculty colleagues for, if they were not picked by the athletic director (for appointment by the president) because of their faithful attendance at sports events, they are bound to become his captives by reason of good seats, trips, and training table meals. At the same time, because the committee usually reports to the president, it has no power per se and is perceived by many as convenient mechanisms for the president to use in keeping his hands off tne athletic department and for it to use in keeping them off. By and large athletic departments run athletic departments, and faculty committees generally have neither the will nor the authority to demand mutual respect from and among coaches and professors.

At the conference level the self-regulatory services which substitute for the accreditation function seem somehow to work better. Presidents, who seldom attend NCAA Conventions, are more inclined to gather in small groups of the brethren from similar types of institutions and, particularly in some of the smaller conferences (really conferences comprised of smaller institutions), they do exert pressure for the maintenance of standards, a pressure which is more moral than legal in conception and application. With more emphasis on the legalities, the same holds true of those conferences of larger institutions whose meetings are normally attended by faculty representatives. These individuals do have a direct

line to their presidents and hence an element of authority in the conference setting which they may not enjoy as one member of a committee back home.

On the professional scene, "professional" this time in terms of those responsible for intercollegiate athletics, the several coaches associations do have committees on ethics and there is interest among some members of the National Association of Collegiate Directors of Athletics (NACDA) in doing something about the accreditation of athletic departments. These organizations appear, however, not to have taken on or been given the power of punishment that exists, say, in the fields of law or medicine. The question as to whether or not they should has been raised. A national study might help contribute to the answer.

At the national level, however, the institutional, regional, and conference differences have until recently co-mingled in the single forums of the NCAA and the NAIA. As noted elsewhere, the results have been so unsuccessful, at least within the NCAA, that it has reorganized itself in three divisions, hoping to find a greater degree of homogeniety within the three parts than had heretofore been possible within the total membership. This search for a more rational configuration was in large measure prompted by the differing needs of the member institutions for the regulatory services of the NCAA.

In the matter of process, the self-regulatory services of the several national athletic associations and the many conferences are, as noted earlier, more corrective than preventive in nature. They depend on punishment after the fact for failure to meet standards of performance in

the recruitment, subsidy, and academic care and feeding of athletes rather than visitation before the fact to prevent failure in meeting them. And they depend, not on before-the-fact observance of operations, but on after-the-fact fingering of a presumably guilty party by a disgruntled colleague.

It would appear that *acting in concert* at the request of if not under the unbrella of a national study commission, *the regional accrediting agencies, the national athletic associations, the collegiate conferences, the professional associations of coaches and athletic directors, and the appropriate national higher education associations could do much to bring about nation-wide adherence to sound standards of conduct in intercollegiate athletics.*

EXTERNAL CONTROLS: At one point in the history of intercollegiate athletics, excesses on the playing field resulted in intervention from outside -- at that point by President Theodore Roosevelt in response to the mayhem that was occurring on the gridiron. He told the nation's colleges and universities do do something about the brutality or he would outlaw football. The NCAA was founded in 1906 to do the job.

Today external pressure is being brought on intercollegiate athletics in the councils of the U.S. Congress to insure that the rights of individual athletes are protected in the organization of international competition. Government sponsorship of an outside agency (external, that is, to higher education and intercollegiate sports) is a part of virtually all of the pieces of legislation currently being proposed. The hearings on these bills are scheduled to resume and congressional

inquiry into all aspects of the conduct of college sports is quite likely to occur. If it does, today's off-the-field excesses could be called into serious question and the possibility of external (government) control raised. Knowledge that the recommend study commission had the matter under study could influence the Congress to let education try to put its own house in order rather than to assign the clean-up to a government body.

Congressional attention has been drawn to intercollegiate athletics as a result of recent incidents growing out of the long-standing feud between the NCAA and the American Amateur Athletic Union (AAU). Congressional concern for amateur sports remains aroused in the interests of national pride.

The NCAA-AAU Feud: It is as dangerous to try to describe the AAU-NCAA feud in a few paragraphs as it is to try to generalize about faculty attitudes toward intercollegiate athletics. Nevertheless, it is a fact of life in the college sports world today and important to have some feel for it as one attempts to address the generality of problems in that area. Joseph Froomkin's paper on "Sports and the Post-Secondary Sector" (Appendix E) deals effectively with this issue in more current detail than is presented below and with particular reference to the federal legislation being proposed to deal with it.

A long-time athletic director who served simultaneously on the governing boards of both organizations pointed to the frustrations involved in trying to understand the situation when he said in effect, "It was hard to realize that the bastards those other bastards were

talking about are these bastards." Feelings run high, reason does not prevail, personalities dwarf issues, the counter-culture finds both sides greedy and rapacious, and whatever is said here is bound to offend somebody, most likely everybody on all three sides of the controversy.

There are documents which suggest that the problem has its roots in the distant past. The AAU is reported to have mishandled Jesse Owens in 1936. The 1929 report suggests that the NCAA hadn't done too well in its first 19 years. Nevertheless, it would appear that the real troubles have developed since World War II. Until about mid-century, the U.S. Olympic Committee was supported primarily by subventions of like amount from the AAU and the NCAA, and each had roughly the same clout in the governance of the U.S.O.C. At about that time two events occurred which tended to blow the alliance apart. First, the U.S.O.C. found that it could successfully raise money on its own and was thus able in effect to declare its independence from its two benefactors. Second, an attempt was made to form a coalition of the NCAA and the representatives of the independent, non-AAU sponsored sports on the U.S.O.C. in a bid to gain control, for reasons which the NCAA considered sound and legitimate and which the AAU found arbitrary and unwarranted. The differences continue.

The feud today appears at first glance to be a struggle for the control of amateur athletics in the United States, although this appears to be something of an exaggeration. The AAU is accused of being an anachronism in a college-sports-dominated world, a holdover from the hey-day of amateur sports clubs around the turn of the century. The NCAA is accused of being a power-mad agency of professional college

coaches. The AAU is held up as the champion of the individual amateur, while the NCAA complains that its member colleges train and supply most of the man-power for the Olympics but have no say over who is chosen to compete or who the coaches will be. Individuals like Douglas MacArthur, James Gavin, Theodore Kheel, and William Scranton have been asked to mediate but, while temporary truces have been effected in order to get through successive Olympic Games, the tensions remain, stronger than ever. The situation has become so intolerable that the U.S. Congress has a number of bills in the works to deal with the situation, to protect the interests of the individual athlete in the power struggle.

While the principle at issue, the rights of the individual athlete, is an important one and while the basic feud is a long-standing one, it would really seem that the specific points currently at issue between the two organizations are finite and centered today around four sports: basketball, track and field, wrestling and gymnastics. The numbers are important. There are, depending on how one counts, between 25 and 30 Olympic sports. The International Olympic Committee designates an organization in each sport in each country to be exclusively responsible for international competition in it. The AAU has controlled U.S. sponsorship for eight. The others are the independent sports, whose representatives on the USOC represent a real third political force in the situation. The NCAA has been supporting what is known as the "federation movement" attempting to get the independent sports, as well as the AAU-dominated ones, aligned in federations sympathetic to the NCAA. But again the sore points exist in respect to

basketball, track and field, wrestling and gymnastics.

After viewing the situation in these sports for a while and seeing the hair turn up on the necks of otherwise reasonable people, and wanting to make sense out of the whole bloody mess, there is a strong temptation to oversimplify, to call it a struggle between the volunteer, dedicated, well-meaning amateurs and the paid, committed, well-intentioned professionals, and to opt for the amateurs. After all, for them the fruits of victory are only the all-expense-paid tours of a camp follower; for the pros on the other hand, it means still more prestige and more money. Unfortunately, the issues are not that clearly drawn. (The section below on amateur- versus professional-ism shows some of the muddy water.) Yet, because they are issues which affect intercollegiate athletics, any national study group had better be prepared to take its own soundings and draw its own conclusions. The results of the inquiry appear to suggest, however, that *the differences involved in the NCAA-AAU controversy are beyond the point of reasonable compromise* (As Joseph Froomkin points out in Appendix E, "It is far too optimistic to expect that gracious cooperation between organizations with international franchises and those dominated by college coaches will take place.") *and* that *some kind of external body along the lines called for in some of the proposed legislation in Washington should be established.*

International Competition: As Froomkin also suggests, congressional attention has been drawn to intercollegiate athletics in the context of its continuing and very natural concern for our national pride because so much of the nation's amateur athletic talent resides in its colleges

and universities. Pertinent to this observation was the adoption by the NCAA at its 1974 convention of a liberalized amateur rule which now permits a college athlete who has signed a professional contract in one sport to remain, for purposes of intercollegiate competition, an amateur in all others. This new regulation appears to put the NCAA into potential conflict with the international sports establishment in still another dimension. This possibility brings into specific focus the two major differences between amateur sports in the United States and in most of the rest of the world. The first is that ours are not sponsored directly by the government. The second is that, as already noted, so many of our amateur sports are college- or university-centered.

The qualifications in the foregoing statements are important: "not directly" in the first and "so many" in the second. While most support is provided directly by other governments (much to the horror of American purists), government support is provided in the United States and it is provided, indirectly to be sure but provided nevertheless, to the extents that state and (to a lesser degree) federal subsidies underwrite the cost of public and (of course to a much lesser degree) private higher education generally and that they are used to provide grants-in-aid to athletes in particular. This support of course affects only those sports in international competition which are in fact college-based; there are as noted in the introduction a good many amateur sports, international and otherwise, which are not college-based. Yet the fact remains that the United States tends to perform best in those events which draw upon college athletes. In studying further the problems of college sports *in relation to international competition*, it will be important to

remember not only that *it is not football but basketball and many of the low-profile sports that bear a direct relationship* to those problems but also that the speedy football player who has signed a professional contract can run against another college but not another country.

ECONOMICS

It was concern over the future financing of big-time intercollegiate athletics that was at the heart of the reasoning which led to the call for this inquiry. On the basis of data supplied by the NCAA and by a number of individual institutions and information supplied in interviews with a number of representatives of college and university athletic and business offices, Robert H. Atwell has prepared the illuminating paper on "Financial Problems of Intercollegiate Athletics," which appears as Appendix B to this report. As suggested above in the prefatory note in the introduction, no summary of Atwell's carefully reasoned document can do it justice. At the risk therefore of gross oversimplification and serious omission, the principal inquirer has, for the purpose hopefully of attracting the reader's attention to the entire paper, condensed Atwell's twenty-eight pages into the following three paragraphs.

The author puts the matter in context by estimating the size of the annual national budget for intercollegiate athletics at about $300 million or roughly 1% of the estimated $30 billion yearly expenditure on higher education. He then goes on to document the basic difference between institutions with big-time and low-profile athletic programs and makes the point that the financing of sports programs in NCAA Division I institutions has very little in common with those of the Division II and III colleges and universities. He suggests that the process in the latter, low-profile institutions is much like that of dealing financially with any aspect of the academic or student services

programs and needs no special treatment here as far as the financing per se is concerned. The big economic problems are indeed in the big-time.

On the revenue side Atwell notes that football accounts on the average for about 70% of the total athletics revenue but only about 50% of the expenditures, that basketball generally tends to break about even, and that all other sports are financial losers.

On the expense side, salaries probably constitute about 1/3 to 2/5 of total expenditures. They have been growing and can be expected to continue doing so basically for two reasons: to keep up with the trend toward greater specialization and to handle increased recruiting needs. Although Atwell finds that financial aid averages about another 1/5 of all expenditures and that it not unexpectedly represents more of the budget at independent than at public institutions, this latter differential is not as large as might be expected because of the growing use of out-of-state athletic talent (for whom remitted tuition charges are higher). Travel and recruitment come to roughly another 1/5 but the principal inquirer takes some issue with Atwell's point that 4% for recruiting "should not be thought of as a major cause of financial difficulty." As Atwell is careful to point out those dollars represent only the direct costs. The principal inquirer was left with the impression in most of the big-time institutions which he visited that as much as one-half of the time of the big-time sports coaching and office staffs are devoted to the task. Finally, in regard to expenditures, the author makes the point that accounting for the costs of plant, maintenance, and operation vary greatly. Although he

does not explicitly call for the adoption of standardized accounting procedures in order to make more meaningful comparisons among institutions, others with whom the inquiry made contact do.

In summarizing his own analysis of the financial problems facing big-time athletics, Atwell says, "Thus, *we have three major factors at work causing a crunch in intercollegiate athletics financing.* First, *we have costs which are increasingly uncontrollable* (by the coach or athletic director or president) *and very responsive to the current inflationary trends of the economy.* (He notes earlier in this regard grants-in-aid tied to rising tuitions and coaches' salaries tied to institutional policies . . . if not levels.) *Secondly, we have costs which, while theoretically discretionary, are in reality determined by the market place in which your institution chooses to compete.* (The number of players on the football squad is a case in point.) *Finally, about 2/3 of the income necessary to support the enterprise comes in the form of gate receipts, the volatility of which is influenced by factors such as success on the field or court, competition from other forms of entertainment including but not limited to professional sports, and the extent to which facilities are already used to capacity."*

Although it was not, as noted elsewhere in this report, the assignment of the inquiry to seek solutions to problems -- only to identify them, it did prove helpful in casting light upon certain issues by pondering possible resolutions to them. Atwell has used that technique and offers analyses of the following possible solutions:

1. Put financial aid on a needs basis.
2. Eliminate financial need in non-revenue-producing sports.
3. Remove the non-revenue-producing sports from the intercollegiate athletic budget.
4. Support of intercollegiate athletics by professional sports.
5. Save money in recruiting.
6. Save money in travel and training tables.
7. Minimize the extent to which the athletic program is financially responsible for the operation of facilities.
8. Do not require intercollegiate athletic programs to support intramural recreation programs.
9. Eliminate two-platoon football.
10. Obtain institutional (general fund) support of the athletics program.
11. Raise more private funds.

Beyond that Atwell calls not for a massive new study but a simple updating of the 1970 NCAA report. He further suggests, as Beasley does in Appendix C, that institutions develop five-year plans and budgets for their sports programs; that the chief executive officers of each athletic conference develop conference-wide strategies for approaching the financial problem (such an approach is incidentally being undertaken currently by the Ivy League); that those plans, budgets, and strategies accommodate the needs and interests of women; and that institutions address themselves to the use of some combination of institutional subsidies and program reductions.

The foregoing paragraphs present a very gross summary of Atwell's report. The three subsections that follow, on "football financing," "student fees," and "the energy crisis," were prepared by the principal

inquirer before the submission of Appendix B. Although they go over some of the same ground, they are included in the interests of comprehensive reporting.

Football Finances: Football and intercollegiate athletics are frequently equated. One institution that gave up intercollegiate football some years ago spends a great deal of time correcting the impression that it had entirely abandoned its intercollegiate sports program. In a similar way today the finances of college football are often misunderstood. For instance, comment is frequently made to the effect that college football is in financial trouble. The impression gained in the course of this inquiry is that most big-time college football programs would, taken by themselves, be self-supporting. Where they are in financial trouble would therefore appear to be in their inability to continue now and in the future to underwrite not only the other intercollegiate sports but also in some instances intra-mural and club programs as well.

In this context, as in others, the question then arises as to whether the big-college, big-time sports (football, basketball, and perhaps, in some instances, hockey) should be asked to support a total (for which read "well-rounded") intercollegiate athletic program. In most small college programs, intercollegiate sports are financed like any academic or extra-curricular activity, out of general funds. It is argued by some that other than the big-time sports in big-college programs should be similarly treated. In fact, one athletic director of a big-time program has so proposed to his board of governors. Tradition and practice, on the other hand, dictate that an athletic

department should internally be treated as a financial whole with some sports supporting others just as in academic departments large freshman courses support small upperclass seminars and as expensive departments such as science support less costly ones such as English or history. Nevertheless, a conceptual precedent for the special treatment of football exists in the new divisional organization of the NCAA.

Here again the answer to a basic question (*Should football have to support all other sports?*) would appear to rest in large measure on an institution's perception of the relationship of sports generally and of intercollegiate athletics in particular to the higher education process on its campus.

Student Fees: One of the major complaints about intercollegiate athletics comes from students required to pay a required fee to support the costs incurred in connection with varsity teams. Although the practice is far from universal, it has been used by a large number of athletic departments as a means of generating additional income. For example, the athletic director of one of the institutions visited in the course of the inquiry made no bones of the fact that he had used them to achieve the mandate given him to make his department self-supporting. At that institution students will for the next thirty years be paying off the cost of the new stadium. In other instances the dollars are used as the primary source of revenue in achieving a balanced budget. In some such cases the fee is simply required and there is no fringe benefit, such as the privileges of getting free admission or of buying tickets to games at reduced prices. In many

others such privileges are offered but students point out that they are still being exploited because they don't all want to take advantage of the opportunity to pay. One of the primary reasons that a major university gave up football was that when, in response to student protest, athletic fees were made voluntary, the financial results were such as to cause the abandonment.

On many other campuses student fees are charged and administered under the auspices of the student government. On a number of them there has been a tradition of appropriating some portion of them for the athletic department. In these cases, continued support is in question in part because of general student protest over the special treatment given to intercollegiate athletics and in part because of the need for more dollars to support the large increase in intramural activity. This process of allocation of student fees is, it turns out, such an important function of student government that, in one state with a strong two-year college program, the student governments on many of its campuses went into hibernation when the state authorities acted to provide public funds to support intercollegiate athletics.

The role of student fees in the support of college sports will be an important topic for consideration by the proposed national study commission.

The Energy Crisis: The energy crisis developed while the inquiry was in progress. Its effects constituted a topic for serious discussion and a special order of formal business at the 1974 NCAA Convention and a number of steps have been taken by individual institutions and

conferences to deal with them. On balance, however, it would appear that, despite some minor aggravation from its fall-out, the situation did not have major consequences for intercollegiate athletics during the 1973-74 winter sports season.

The general concern is primarily financial; the major specific one, the possible effect on crowd attendance during the 1974 football season. In any event, *the implications of the energy crisis as they relate to college sports are* an *important* matter to which the proposed national study commission should give serious continuing attention.

SPORTS AND EDUCATION

Although as recently noted the assignment to the inquiry team was to define and organize the problems relating to intercollegiate athletics and not to seek solutions, it proved useful on occasion to ponder solutions in order to throw light on the nature of the underlying problems. That approach again proved particularly helpful in attempting to deal with the fundamental question of the relationship of intercollegiate sports to the educational process. *Given the likelihood that football and basketball will not for long be able to support the non-revenue-producing sports in a well-rounded intercollegiate athletic program, should those sports be abolished, relegated to intramural or club status, or supported out of general funds?*

Seeking educational answers to that question is complicated by a number of factors: the variety of perceptions of the place (or non-place) of intercollegiate sports in the higher education enterprise; by differing attitudes about the roles of a college or university as an intellectual community and a socializing agency; by different opinions as to the value of sports to spectator and participant; by varying perceptions of the relationship of intercollegiate to intra- and extra-mural sports; by the growing needs of preprofessional athletes; by a lack of adequate information about the performance and persistence of participants in big-time sports; and by the absence,

outside the field of physical education, of much scholarly attention to the role of sports in relation to sociology, economics, political science, philosophy, law, medicine, and other similar traditional academic areas. The proposed national study Commission on Intercollegiate Sports will have as perhaps its most important assignment the task of finding its way through these complexities, for *how one proposes to resolve the problems of finance or recruiting excesses depends on how one perceives the relationship of intercollegiate sports to higher education.*

POLICY CONTROL AND ADMINISTRATION: The variety of perceptions of the relationship of intercollegiate athletics to the higher educational enterprise is nowhere more apparent than in the diversity of ways in which institutions control and administer their several sports-related activities. Athletic departments are variously operated as being an academic affair (in this instance usually as part of the physical education department), a student service (or extra-curricular activity), an auxiliary enterprise (reporting to the vice president for business affairs), an independent activity (reporting directly to the president), or an independent enterprise with its own board of directors.

The pertinent issue at the time of the 1929 Carnegie report was whether control of college sports should rest with the students, the alumni, the faculty, the administration, or the trustees. The recommendation at that time was to return policy control to the students. What appears to have happened, however, has been a general devolution of responsibility upon the administration, which has in turn and in a

variety of combinations developed advisory bodies involving some or all of the other four parties a nterest. Thus today in the broadest sense, *policy determination for intercollegiate athletics usually rests with the administration*--with the trustees and the president--and it is they who are responsible for its assignment within the administrative hierarchy, and hence for the prior determination of its relationship to the rest of the institution.

Among the institutions visited in the course of the inquiry, the lack of consistency in this assignment process was most uniquely demonstrated at one where intercollegiate athletics for women is handled as an academic affair through the physical education department and the school of education, intramural and club sports as a student service, and intercollegiate athletics for men as an auxiliary enterprise. In the same city is a small college where all sports are under the direction of the physical education department. In the same conference is an athletic director who reports to the vice president for student services. In another institution of equal athletic renown the athletic director reports directly to the president and in one of its sister institutions the reporting is reputed to go the other way.

The American Council on Education has, as noted in the section on financing, published guidelines for accounting for intercollegiate athletics, bases for classifying athletic department expenses as academic affairs, student services, and auxiliary enterprises. While there is some conformance with these recommended classifications,

enough exceptions have, as suggested above, turned up in the course of the inquiry to indicate that an investigation of practices in this regard might be included in any national study and the commission's recommendations should be developed with respect to the administration of all sports-related activities. Such an investigation should shed useful light on the question of the relationships as currently perceived between sports and education.

INTERCOLLEGIATE ATHLETICS AND THE EDUCATIONAL PROCESS: *In question at the root of all the problems besetting intercollegiate athletics is their relationship to higher education, their place in the educational process.* Sorting out the possible answers is complicated by variations that exist in two dimensions. One has to do with the differences between participant and spectator; the other, with the aims of higher education. In the latter regard first, two purposes are usually ascribed to an undergraduate college: to be an intellectual institution concerned with training the habits and powers of the mind and to be a socializing agency concerned with preparing students for life. Intercollegiate athletics have variously been perceived as contributing to both, to neither, or to one or the other of these goals. As between spectator and participant, there is a strong body of opinion that intercollegiate athletics can be justified only in terms of their value to the participants and that spectator interests should not be given precedence. Nevertheless, there are those who promulgate the strong body theories which ascribe an indirect benefit from college sports to academic well-being. They are said to

foster on behalf of the individual participant the healthy body in which the healthy mind can most effectively operate. And they serve vicariously to keep the collective student body healthy by providing it an opportunity for letting off steam. But except for this last indirect attribution of some benefit from intercollegiate sports to those who watch rather than to those who play, there is little argument that there is an intellectual value in them for the spectator.

As far as the participant is concerned, intercollegiate sports, particularly big-time ones, are perceived by many as an intrusion upon the academic process. Nevertheless, playing on a college or university team is still being recognized on some campuses as part of the formal educational process. Although, as noted below in the section on physical education, the incidence of such recognition is rapidly diminishing, it still exists at those institutions which have a general physical education requirement but allow participation on an intercollegiate team as a substitute. The point to be emphasized here is that the concept of using participation in college sports to fulfill a degree requirement is not new and is germane to the question now being raised seriously, but often taken facetiously, as to whether formal degree credit should be awarded to students participating in big-time sports and aspiring to professional careers in them. An issue with many ramifications, it certainly is one that deserves attention in any national study of intercollegiate athletics. (Parenthetically it should be noted here that sports have also received recognition at the doctoral level through the award of at least one

institution of the honorary degree of Doctor of Athletic Arts.)

The primary arguments relating intercollegiate athletics to the higher education enterprise are made in connection with the undergraduate college's role as a socializing agency. Again, the distinction must be made between the relationship of participant and spectator.

First, the role of college sports on behalf of the participant in relation to the socializing function of higher education. One reason for college sports with which almost everyone agrees is that they provide an important extracurricular outlet for exploration by the individual student. Another set of arguments has to do with the matter of lessons learned outside the classroom. Proponents of athletics point, for instance, to the values of learning to live with competition in preparation for survival in today's "dog-eat-dog" society; to the lessons in teamwork and cooperation implicit in team sports, and in motivation and persistence in individual ones, qualities which are so essential to survival in the business world; and to the benefits gained from having to plan the use of one's time. Although the critics of big-time sports would disagree, sports generally are also credited by their supporters with building character: teaching participants how to cooperate (again, although with a social emphasis here), to win and lose graciously, to live with adversity, and to respect the physical side of man -- and woman. They provide an opportunity for exercising or releasing the animal spirits of the young. And, finally, intercollegiate sports in particular are seen philosophically as inspiration to the achievement of excellence, as providing an opportunity beyond the walls of a given institution for testing the quality of one's athletic ability.

These are of course the familiar arguments of behalf of sports in general and intercollegiate athletics in particular as they affect the individual participant.

The critics focus their attacks on two of these arguments. As noted in the section on the attitudes of the counterculture, they suggest that the way big-time college sports are organized and run make athletes willing victims of today's highly structured industrial complex and that instead of building character, they destroy it through exposure to the unethical and immoral practices in which the athletic establishment indulges.

There is one less familiar line of reasoning relating sports to the higher education process which was brought to light during the course of the inquiry. Although it rests its case primarily in terms of the extra-curriculum, it does in its most extreme form make a connection to the academic process and suggest that sports may even be a humanity. The connection runs from intercollegiate athletics to sports to gymnastics to the dance to drama to the arts. If credit is given for studio art, why not for football performance? Or if that question is too drastic, then why at least, if the provision of entertainment by means of public performance in the drama for which an admission charge is levied is acceptable, is not an intercollegiate athletic contest similarly a worthy extracurricular activity? (See Lowi's treatment of this issue in Appendix G.)

The standard recital of the benefits of intercollegiate athletics to the student body, to the college community, and to the alumni as spectators is equally as familiar as that of those ascribed to the

participant. They provide an excuse for letting off steam to the first, and a rallying point for all three; they provide a moral equivalent for war and frontier violence; and they build morale. The critics of course counter with the observations that the big-time sports are no longer conducted for the students and the greater college community but for the general public, that they exploit students on behalf of institutions, that they spawn excesses by a few overzealous alumni in the recruiting and subsidy of athletes, and that they have put higher education squarely in the entertainment business, which is not, they claim, the business of education. More dispassionate observers such as Joseph Froomkin (see Appendix E) point out how little attention has been given to the role of college spectator sports as "a training for consumer-spectators for the rest of their adult lives."

Aside from these more and less familiar arguments and counter arguments over the relationship of intercollegiate athletics to the socializing function of higher education in terms of their spectators, there are again the same, more subtle considerations regarding the entertainment function noted above with respect to the participants. Why should it be acceptable for the student to provide entertainment through the medium of the theatre but questionable for him to do so through the medium of the sports arena?

The Well-Rounded Concept: At the 1974 convention the NCAA leadership proposed a requirement that all Division I institutions should (in order to qualify as big-time athletically) offer at least eight intercollegiate sports. During the course of the inquiry, note was taken

of the intentions of a number of leading football powers to expand or beef up the balance of their intercollegiate athletic program. In these and similar ways, a diversified sports program has somehow managed to become equated with overall institutional quality. Upon inquiry, however, one finds that this concept apparently has its justification in practice and tradition and not in any philosophical considerations unique to athletics. "It just seems to make common sense," some say and leave it at that. Pursuit of the subject soon brings forth a comparison with academic departments (usually with the humanities or social sciences) wherein the tuition paid for low-cost freshman survey courses supports high-cost senior seminars. It is pointed out, however, that there is an inconsistency in this line of reasoning -- that, while the freshman tuition-payer becomes the senior-seminar beneficiary, the income-producing football (or basketball) player is seldom the low-profile (or minor) team member.

Yet practice in low-profile college sports programs suggests that well-roundedness is a virtue, for many institutions, both public and independent, use general funds or receive legislative subsidies to support broad-based intercollegiate athletic opportunities. Indeed the concept is so well established that, when a former All-American and current professional sports star suggested during the course of the inquiry that the answer to the financial problem was to abandon all the non-income-producing sports and let football and basketball support themselves, the initial reaction was frankly one of shock and disbelief. Nevertheless, upon reflection, it would appear that the suggestion

represents *a serious questioning of the assumption that the big-time income-producing sports should be expected to support all other intercollegiate athletics.* This assumption is one that would deserve educational rather than just financial attention in any national study of the field.

The Athletic Standard of Living: As institutions and athletic departments have pondered the question of making their intercollegiate sports ends meet, the suggestion is frequently made that the low-profile sports in big-time sports programs do not need to enjoy the same standard of athletic living as their revenue-producing benefactors. At the same time, of course, the devotees of the low-profile teams are making their case for having their athletes enjoy the same privileges as the big-time ones: a night in a local motel before a home game, jet air travel, training table meals, special dormitories, educational counseling, and the like. Regardless of the merits of the arguments, the fact remains that big-time football and basketball in emulating their professional counterparts have set standards of athletic living to which other sports aspire. Although the current economic pressure on athletic departments is causing a reevaluation of those standards -- and a lowering of them in a good many instances (no night in the motel and self-service instead of being waited on are examples) -- the issues are both ones that deserve attention....*Whether the big-time standard of athletic living is too high and whether big-time and low-profile sports should have the same or different standards.*

INTRAMURAL, EXTRAMURAL, AND CLUB SPORTS: Contemplation of the place of intercollegiate athletics in the higher education enterprise cannot of course be divorced from their relationship to the other physical activities sponsored by colleges and universities -- intramural and extramural (or club) sports and physical education.

While there may be confusion over the place of intercollegiate athletics on the organization chart of higher education, the same is not true of intramural and extramural sports. They are usually allied with physical education at smaller institutions with low-profile athletic programs and perceived as extra-curricular activities, reporting through the student services channel, at institutions with big-time sports.

Intramural Sports: The 1929 Carnegie report called for an increase in participation in sports through expansion of intramural programs. Indeed it found one justification for the existence of big-time sports programs in the financial support that they could provide for these less formal activities. Nevertheless, it has not been until very recent years that such an increase has taken place and it has occurred not as a result of belated institutional recognition of that earlier recommendation but in response to the demands of students. *One of the frankly unexpected findings of the initial inquiry*, specifically documented in Springer's paper (see Appendix I), *was the almost universal reporting of a burgeoning interest on the part of students in participation in sports activities of all kinds, from tackle and touch football to karate and ultimate frisbee.* This new development is serving to complicate the life of intercollegiate athletics in a variety of ways.

There are the inevitable financial consequences. Coming as it has at a time where dollars for higher education are short, this universal interest in intra-institutional athletic activities has often served to put intramural and intercollegiate sports in conflict for them. For example, given the need for a budget cut and the decision that athletics-as-a-whole must bear its fair share, should a particular intercollegiate team be abolished or should three or four intramural sports be abandoned? Where student fees are involved, student attitudes are clear -- and in conflict with the athletic department.

There are increased demands on facilities that are inevitably believed to be inadequate in the first place. Who should have priority in use of the swimming pool or hockey rink or playing field, the few participants on the varsity team or the many of the intramurals -- priority not so much as to "when" (Most students seem to agree or take for granted that varsity teams should have prime time) but as to "how much"?

There are continuing administrative complexities. Although intramural athletics appear, at least at the institutions visited in the initial inquiry, to be most often considered as an extra-curricular activity comprehended within the world of the vice president for student services, they are occasionally handled by either the department of physical education or the athletic department. The answers raised above about dollars and facilities are frequently a natural function of the placement of intramurals in the administrative hierarchy.

At the same time they have participatory, financial and administrative advantages over intercollegiate sports. They, are, as already

implied, more inclusive and less expensive. And they are less demanding of administrative attention, with the students themselves bearing the major part of the responsibility for their conduct. They appear also on many campuses to be having the effect of rekindling student interest in watching intercollegiate events, an interest which is generally believed to have waned sharply during the protest years of the late 1960s and very early 1970s. It will be interesting to observe if and how this new kind of spectatorship will carry over into the post-college years. But at least for now it can be observed that *the sportsmindedness of our culture* has reinvaded the U.S. college campus and is very much alive there. *As reflected in the growth of intramural sports, it needs to be taken carefully into account by each institution in determining the respective roles of that enterprise and intercollegiate athletics on its campus.*

Extramural or Club Sports: Extramural sports are those in which there is informal intercollegiate competition not sponsored by the athletic department. To the extent that they ultimately receive athletic department sanction, they are in a sense the historical forerunner of intercollegiate athletics. Administered separately from varsity sports and usually under the same authority as intramurals, they are run infomally and financially supported for the most part by the participants or by student fees, are not formally sponsored by the institution, are permitted without charge to use institutional athletic facilities but receive little or no budgetary help, have amateur coaches for the most part, frequently involve graduate as well as undergraduate

students, and are sports in which there is usually no varsity team. By and large, they are recognized team sports having relatively limited participant appeal. That is, they provide a medium for competition in sports for which there is not usually enough demand to warrant introduction of an intramural program. Some are sports in which there is formally (NCAA) recognized intercollegiate competition introduced by students whose goal is ultimately to have them officially sponsored by the athletic department; these would include lacrosse, soccer, gymnastics, hockey and the like. Football is often reintroduced on a club level at colleges that have earlier given it up on a formal intercollegiate basis. Others are formally (NCAA) unrecognized but equally recognizable sports such as rugby, polo, crew, and the like.

Account will have to be taken of the role played by extramural sports in any national study of intercollegiate athletics not only because of movement of certain sports in and out of the club arena but also because *there are those who see a solution to the economic problems of intercollegiate athletics in returning all but the revenue-producing sports to extramural status*. Their argument is that interested students and dedicated former (alumni) participants will not let their particular sport die. (See Springer, Appendix I, for treatment of the role of extramural sports in relation to the abandonment of football.)

Graduate Students and Intercollegiate Athletics: The first athletic director formally visited in the course of the inquiry made the point that he was becoming more a university official than just a college one. The president of another institution recounted the experiences of his

lacrosse team. Begun on a club basis, it became quite successful in competition against formally sponsored teams. In due course, it sought and received full varsity status -- and then promptly managed to have a disastrous season because it could no longer use the graduate students who were the backbone of the squad. Although the question of graduate student participation in intercollegiate athletics produces little but raised eyebrows when asked within the traditional college sports establishment, it is one that deserves attention from the proposed national study commission within the context of the general issue of the relationship of athletics to education. *If sports competition is beneficial to the secondary school student and to the college undergraduate, why isn't it also good for the graduate student?*

PHYSICAL EDUCATION: The relationship of intercollegiate athletics to physical education is full of contradictions and misconceptions. Administratively, as noted elsewhere in this report (see Administration), departments of athletics may sometimes be part of departments of physical education -- or vice versa. Yet more often than not physical education finds itself part of the academic hierarchy with intercollegiate athletics considered either a student service or an auxiliary (business) enterprise.

Financially, the differences in practices are, if anything, even more complicated and often impossible to fathom. At the risk, however, of gross oversimplification, it would appear that while physical education department budgets are often used to underwrite expenses of intercollegiate athletics, the reverse is seldom true. It may obtain in instances

where physical facilities have been paid for with gate receipts from intercollegiate events. However, those instances are few and far between. More frequent are the cases where facilities built with general funds are used for intercollegiate sports and where the physical education department pays 80% of the coach's salary but gets only 20% of his time. As noted in the section of this report on Finances, more realistic means of allocating costs between the physical education and athletic departments must be developed.

At root, however, these variations in the administrative and financial handling of the relationship between these two enterprises reflect substantive differences in the perception of them which seem greater today than in the past. For instance, participation on freshman and varsity teams was on most campuses considered a substitute for generally required physical education courses. In recent years, however, physical education requirements have been abolished at most colleges and universities and with their disappearance has come no compensating diminution of course demands on athletes competing in intercollegiate sports. Hence, today's athletes find themselves faced, technically at least, with more rigorous academic programs than their predecessors. At the same time, the substance of the physical education major has progressively become so much more demanding that participants in big-time, big-institution intercollegiate sports cannot hope to cope with it. The lab science requirements are such, for example, that athletes cannot afford the time.

The effects of these changes can be seen throughout the academic

world. For one thing, the resultant increase in the professional qualifications for teaching-and-coaching positions, particularly at the secondary school level, where the two activities remain inextricably linked, has served to lessen the chances of the gifted athlete to become a school or college coach. For another, it has served to diminish administrative sympathy toward athletics. This latter comment obviously deserves some explanation.

In an earlier day, secondary school coaches for a given sport were normally recruited from individuals who had played it in college. At the same time, when school boards were looking for principals, they turned frequently to a coach who had demonstrated his capacity for leadership and discipline. However, as the professional education demands on school administrators on the one hand and physical education teachers (and coaches) on the other have become more specialized, the number of school administrators with backgrounds in, and presumably affection for, competitive sports has decreased. As a result, although the mentor has one foot each in the internal academic world through physical education and the external competitive sports world through coaching, the administrative climate in today's secondary school tends to foster a perception of the difference between the two worlds which seems somehow to be carried over to and confirmed at the college level (as noted in the section of this report on Education). Thus, in a curious combination of circumstances, *the abandonment of general physical education requirements and the increase in the sophistication of the physical education major have served as important factors in making more tenuous the re-*

lationship between big-time intercollegiate athletics and the formal educational process.

It is not here suggested that that relationship should again be rationalized and reestablished on the old basis. Rather a new rationalization, taking account of today's circumstances as they relate to physical education and intercollegiate athletics, must be developed.

EDUCATION OF THE ATHLETE: *The results of the inquiry suggest that most of the rules for the conduct of intercollegiate sports were written to protect institutions from each other in the big-time sports and that the interests and the education of the athletes themselves, as individuals, come second.* Of course, most athletes engaged in intercollegiate sports do not aspire to professional careers and are involved in low-key programs, which are not commercial and therefore do not exploit them. However, on behalf of those who are in the big-time or who do aspire to professional careers, there are some issues that need attention.

The Preprofessional Athlete: The dramatic growth of the past few years in the number of preprofessional aspirants participating in college sports has generated a set of problems which deserve attention in the study of intercollegiate athletics recommended as a result of this inquiry.

Two of the results of the recent rapid growth of professional sports in the United States have been the increases in the demand for athletes to play for pay and in the expectations of college players

for professional careers. Since World War II the number of major league professional franchises in football, basketball, and hockey have been more than doubled, while the number in baseball is up by fifty per cent. The National Football League is planning to continue its gradual expansion by adding at least four more franchises to the existing twenty-six and a new operation, the World Football League, is on the drawing boards. Similarly, major league basketball and baseball are contemplating the possibilities of continued slow but steady growth. Only hockey appears for the moment to have overextended itself with its very rapid expansion of the National Hockey League and the establishment of the World Hockey Association. It is likely therefore, that *the demand by professional sports for college trained athletes will continue to grow* in the years immediately ahead.

This growth, coupled with extended coverage of professional sports by the press and their expanded exposure on television, *has served to generate an increase in the expectations of young athletes for professional careers*. Sports reporters who have gone on the skywriter tours (visits to the pre-season football training camps) attest to the fact that, whereas only a very small percentage of them will be drafted and less than a third of those few will be retained, something on the order of a half of the big-time college football players aspire to play for pay. For such preprofessional hopefuls, college participation provides a chance both to develop and to demonstrate their talents. For them sport is a serious business, as serious a business for instance, as their classroom education is to aspiring teachers. For their coaches, it is serious business, too, and the resultant demands (that coaches put upon

players and that players put upon themselves) make it impossible for all but the very brightest scholar athlete to devote the necessary time both to his sport and to a full-time academic load. The NCAA rules make something of a gesture in this regard by permitting an athlete four years of eligibility within any consecutive five-year span. Yet, even with this allowance, there are countless big-time college athletes who have used up both their four and five years and left college without their degrees.

At the same time, the feeling persists in many quarters that athletes should receive the same treatment as every other student -- that he should carry the same academic load (when, as noted, it is frequently impossible to do so) and that he should receive the same amount and type of financial aid (when the football player's opportunities for summer work are shortened by a month because of pre-season practice and for on-campus employment are eliminated by the need to practice). *The question as to whether the pre-professional athlete* (or any athlete participating in the demanding big-time sports, for that matter) *should receive special treatment is one of the issues that deserves* national *attention.* Not that a single national solution should be proposed but rather that considerations involved should be laid out in such a way that each institution might knowledgeably make its own decision.

A number of solutions have been proposed. Some would tend to separate the preprofessional athlete from individual institutions. A political scientist, recognizing the need for some kind of state identification, has proposed that each state field a Triple A farm club for the urban pros, again with some kind of educational fringe benefit

built in. A humanist, recognizing the need to develop talent for the sports part of the entertainment industry, has proposed a similar kind of minor league program organized around population centers. For instance, the New Brunswick, New Jersey, Bears might call upon the best football players on the Princeton and Rutgers squads, attract the occasional brilliant player from smaller colleges like Upsala or Wagner, and give an opportunity to the individual from New York University, which has no football at this time.

Other solutions would retain an identity with existing institutional programs. As early as 1948 one college president was calling for the full-time employment of players to represent colleges and universities on the gridiron, offering them special privileges as students in off-season semesters. This idea has since been proposed by a number of chief executive officers. More recently, other college presidents have suggested that preprofessional training should be formally recognized as a legitimate course of study and credit given toward a degree for participation in big-time sports programs. Two not unrelated proposals were developed in the course of this inquiry. One would recognize such participation as work within a program similar to those offered at Antioch and Northeastern, where students alternate between working full-time for a semester and going to college full-time. The other would be a relaxation of the four-in-five rule, allowing a much reduced academic workload and accumulating educational insurance privileges which could be cashed in later while playing professional ball or when cut from a professional squad by reason of inability or injury or when the individual fails even to get a try-out.

Consideration of these and other suggestions for ways and means of handling the growing number of preprofessional athletes could serve as a useful mechanism within a national study of intercollegiate athletics for looking at this new phenomenon, *for the question needs to be answered as to whether participation in big-time sports (or in any sport by an athlete receiving a full-ride grant-in-aid) should be considered as employment or as course work or as an extra-curricular activity.*

Academic Performance and Persistence of Athletes: Although no definitive studies were reviewed or conducted in the course of the inquiry, *the impression* gained from the reports of research that has been done on individual campuses and from the observations of those close to the scene *is that college athletes as a group tend on the average to beat their academic predictions and to have a higher persistence rate than students not engaged in intercollegiate sports.* Research at the secondary level has demonstrated that individuals playing on interscholastic teams get higher grades than would be expected from their standardized test scores and that they do better regardless of the subgroup of students chosen -- poor, wealthy, bright, slow, black, white. It is generally admitted that in the big-time, scholar-athletes on the average have lower school records, test scores and academic predictions than other students at the time of admission -- in effect, that they do indeed get preferential treatment because of their athletic ability. That they tend thereafter to outperform other students comes as no surprise to careful observers of the scene. They point to the incentive which the athletes have for continued

development and demonstration of their talents and to the special academic care and feeding which they receive.

At the same time, there is *the apparently contradictory observation* noted in other connections on this report *that only the very brightest athletes are able to carry a full academic load*, an observation given credence by the existence of the NCAA's five-year rule (which allows an athlete four years of eligibility within a five-year period). This allowance, however, is but one manifestation of the special care and feeding which is given. Supporters of intercollegiate sports then point to the outstanding records of exceptional athletes -- All-Americans who become Rhodes Scholars, for instance -- as further evidence that big-time sports don't get in the way of academic achievement. Such cases, however, appear to be exceptional and one student of the problem, the academic counselor at a major athletic power, notes that athletes tend generally to earn Bs and Cs regardless of their initial predictions -- the higher predictors drawn back to the middle of the scale by the demands of their participation in sports and the lower predictors brought up toward the average by the special efforts of "brain coaches" like himself. The thesis that scholar athletes do better in than out-of-season is hotly debated.

In any event, *the question of relative performance and persistence remains an important issue in any discussion of intercollegiate athletics* and is a subject to which a national study commission or advisory group should seriously consider giving special attention.

SCHOLARLY INATTENTION: The fact that, as one long-time observer of the college sports scene has noted, intercollegiate "*athletics have drifted from the mainstream of American education*" is nowhere more apparent than in the lack of attention that has been given to the field by members of faculty departments whose subject matter interest has relevance to the topic. The inquiry was fortunate in having brought to its attention a number of individual and institutional exceptions to this general rule. Indeed the number is such as conceivably to suggest the possibility of an incipient reversal of the trend. And yet while a few sociologists, political scientists, philosophers, psychologists, economists, lawyers and doctors with scholarly interests in sports and college athletics were identified, there were only one or two who could be said to have a primary interest in the field. At the same time, virtually all of the institutional exceptions existed in physical-education-departments-turned-departments-of-sports-sciences-and-leisure-studies at state-teachers-colleges-turned-universities manned by physical-educators-turned-social-scientists. Yet even in these latter instances, however, the introduction of psychological and sociological discourse is relatively a new phenomenon. The proposed national study Commission on Intercollegiate Sports could serve to insure the reversal of the observed drift by itself sponsoring some faculty-based research studies and by encouraging the conduct of still others. Appendices D and G are pregnant in this regard.

If the Marxists are right that sports are the current substitute for religion as the opiate for the masses, then both they and their

idealogical enemies might do well to ponder seriously the suggestion of one college graduate in the alumni magazine of a well-known higher institution to the effect that it should establish a "College of Sport", in this case to be the current substitute for the School of Divinity. While this latter idea is of course no more than exaggeration for effect, the fact remains that one of our nation's primary areas of interest, sports in general, and intercollegiate sports in particular, remains relatively unexplored in the formal academic sense.

ISSUES FOR CONSIDERATION BY THE COMMISSION

Throughout the preceding sections of this report a number of propositions have been posed for consideration by the proposed national study commission, a number of questions with which it might deal have been raised, and a number of points for it to keep in mind in the course of its deliberations have been made. Those propositions, questions, and points are reworded, reordered, and summarized below within a framework which it is hoped will be useful in the organization of the work of the proposed commission. It also provides an amplification of the questions posed in the synopsis at the beginning of this volume.

Although the questions are reordered and reworded, the framework within which they are offered is sequentially and substantively consistent with the order of presentation in the preceding sections of the principal report. The rationale for the organization of the material above, in case it has escaped the reader, and of the issues below can be summarized as follows: The attitudes of the parties-at-interest toward intercollegiate athletics affect and are affected by the manner in which college sports are conducted. Trustees focus on finance, presidents remain inattentive to the ethical problems but are becoming concerned about dollars, the great majority of faculty members continue to be silent and uncommitted but bid fair also to become interested in the cost of sports as big-time athletic departments increasingly compete with them for the education dollar, more and more students are participating and may even be beginning to become spectators again,

most athletes seem content, athletic directors and coaches profess to not being sure what the fuss is all about yet find themselves faced in the big-time with the increasingly difficult commercial necessity of making their financial ends meet, a few alumni put heavy pressure on to win, parents seek headlines for their scholar athletes, and the spectator public demands a big-time winner. The public interest, as reflected in cases before the courts, in the actions of state legislatures, and in bills proposed to the U.S. Congress, suggests that intercollegiate athletics may well soon become a matter of important not peripheral moment. But, most importantly, the nation's women and its minorities are demanding an end to discrimination in the conduct of college sports.

Against this background, big-time college sports find themselves competing with professional sports and television for the entertainment dollar and with each other for the talent that will produce a winner. In the process, the escalation of the potential for, and of the likelihood of, ethical excesses in the recruiting, subsidy, and care and feeding of athletes continues. As it does, the adequacy of existing enforcement policies and procedures is being more and more called into question. These circumstances represent the current and more volatile manifestations of a problem that was identified in the 1929 Carnegie report, looked at in the early 1950's, and has in the meantime remained unresolved -- a problem of morality that is given new dimensions by the demands of women and blacks.

It was, however, not the old familiar problem of unethical practices but the new problem of dollars that prompted the call for this inquiry.

It is a problem posed by uncontrollable operating costs, the costs of keeping up with the competition, and the price-elastic nature of gate receipts. And it is a problem that exacerbates the ethical dilemma of intercollegiate sports by creating still more pressure for victory at any moral cost.

Solutions to the ethical and financial questions cannot, however, be achieved in a vacuum. They must be based on a rational relationship between intercollegiate athletics and the higher education process. And it must be one that is not only capable of implementation in the administrative sense, but also acceptable in the intellectual sense.

The questions to which the attention of the proposed Commission on Intercollegiate Sports should be addressed are therefore organized below according first to the moral issues, next to the economic issues, and third to the educational issues of process and policy. Possible issues for commission consideration in the broader intellectual sense are discussed in a fourth subsection. The fifth and final subsection deals with proposals regarding a research effort for the proposed commission.

THE MORAL ISSUES: There are three sets of questions which deal basically with the moral issues facing intercollegiate athletics today. The first deals with unethical practices in their conduct; the second, with the exploitation of minorities; and the third, with the demands of women for equal rights in college sports.

On the issue of unethical practices:

What is the extent of violations of rules pertaining to the conduct of intercollegiate athletics?

What are the most effective ways of policing spectator sports in higher education?

Are the current enforcement mechanisms appropriate? . . . adequate?

What should the respective roles of the national institutional athletic associations and the several athletic conferences be in the policing of intercollegiate athletics?

What should the respective roles of the professional athletic associations be?

Should the accreditation process be adapted for use in connection with intercollegiate athletics?

Should low-profile, non-revenue-producing sports be conducted at the same level of professionalism as the big-time, revenue-producing ones?

Should a super-big-time level of intercollegiate athletics be established?

Should athletic conferences be realigned to even out the competition between the "haves" and the "have-nots?"

Would it be conceivable to vary the size of permitted recruiting numbers or squad rosters in some proportion to the won-lost record?

Should athletes receive the same treatment as other students? big-time? low-profile?

Should participants in big-time sports be expected to carry a full academic load? If not, what proportion should they carry? In season? Out of season?

Does the five-year eligibility rule provide adequate time for the big-time athlete to complete his education? Is the regulation appropriate for women?

What is the performance and persistence record of athletes by sports and by curriculum? Are there differences between white and Black athletes in these regards?

Is there need for improved guidance for athletes at the secondary level? for a "truth in recruiting program?"

On the issue of discrimination against minority athletes:

What is the extent of discrimination against Black athletes?

What are the relative performance and persistence records of Black athletes? Do their rates differ from those of white athletes? What are the distinguishing factors in relation to their performance?

What are the special problems of Black women athletes? in predominantly Black institutions? in predominantly white and/or integrated ones?

What is the status of Blacks in the coaching and officiating ranks?

Are the predominantly Black colleges suffering in competition with predominantly white and/or integrated institutions for Black athletes?

Are Black athletes receiving appropriate treatment from the media? Are blacks sufficiently well represented as members of the media?

On the issue of discrimination against women:

How pervasive is discrimination against women in intercollegiate athletics? as participants? as coaches and administrators?

How can colleges and universities comply with the requirements of Title IX of the Educational Amendments Act of 1972 to provide equal opportunities for women in college sports?

What facilities, equipment, budgets, and leadership should be provided to permit women to develop athletically?

Legal considerations aside, should college sports for women be conducted in relation to those for men on an integrated or a separate-but-equal basis?

THE FINANCIAL ISSUES: There are several sets of questions which deal with the financing of intercollegiate athletics. The first deals with probable future developments, a second with ideal financial arrangements, a third with long-range financial planning, and the last with the energy crisis:

Will the general economic crunch on higher education continue? If so, for how long?

Will some higher institutions continue in the entertainment business?

Will college sports continue on balance to lose ground to professional sports as an object of public interest and attention?

Will the financial pressures on intercollegiate athletics continue to intensify?

What may be expected to happen to revenues for intercollegiate athletics?

What may be expected to happen to expenditures?

How should intercollegiate athletics be financed? in the big-time? low-profile?

Should net income from big-time football and basketball be expected to cover the net costs of the low-profile, non-income-producing sports? for men? for men and women?

Should big-time athletic departments be expected to break even financially? as in the past for men only? for men and women?

How should the net loss of a big-time athletic program be covered?

Should aid to student athletes be awarded on the basis of need?

Should student fees be used to support intercollegiate athletics?

Should women's intercollegiate athletics be expected to be self-supporting?

Should professional sports be expected to provide support to intercollegiate athletics?

(Do professional farm system operations make or lose money?)

What should a comprehensive, adequate program of intercollegiate athletics for men and women, geared to the educational rather than the entertainment function, cost?

Should standardized methods be established for accounting for intercollegiate athletics?

What kind of long-range projections should institutions, both big-time and low-profile, two- and four-year, be encouraged to develop in planning their athletic programs for men and women over the next five to ten years?

What will the effect of the energy crisis be on the conduct of college sports?

THE EDUCATIONAL ISSUES: There are two sets of issues that bear with variable directness upon the place of intercollegiate athletics in higher education. One has to do with their relationship to the educational process and function; the second, with policy determination regarding them.

On the issue of relationship to educational mission:

What is the proper relationship of intercollegiate athletics, both big-time and low-profile, to higher education?

> What are the values being transmitted by intercollegiate sports? to participants? to spectators? What should they be?
>
> What should the responsibilities of the postsecondary sector be in educating its constituency as potential occasional adult participants in sports? team? individual?
>
> What are the appropriate relationships among intercollegiate athletics and intramural and extramural sports?
>
> What are the appropriate relationships between intercollegiate athletics and physical education?
>
> Should participation in college sports be restricted to undergraduates?

Is sports entertainment a proper function of higher education?

> Is it appropriate for some higher institutions to provide the public (or some of its publics) with big-time sports entertainment?
>
> Why is it apparently appropriate for participants to engage in the entertainment function through the medium of the theatre but questionable through the sports arena?

What should the response of higher education be to the effects of growth of professional sports?

> Are professional sports going to continue to expand and will the demand for trained pre-professional athletes continue to grow if they do?

Should the training of pre-professional athletes be the responsibility of any college or university? If so, in what context should it be offered? for credit? as work? as an extra-curricular activity?

What are the realities with respect to opportunities in professional sports for college athletes?

Should intercollegiate athletics maintain an arm's length attitude toward professional sports or seek closer cooperation?

What should the responsibilities of post-secondary institutions be in facilitating the participation of star athletes in and preparing them for international competition?

What are the unique problems of two-year colleges? in relation to one another? to secondary schools? to four-year colleges?

On the issue of policy determination:

What should the role of the college president be in the handling of intercollegiate athletics?

Are the problems of intercollegiate athletics in the mid-1970s of sufficient relative importance among all the problems facing today's college or university president to warrant his attention now?

Have college presidents gone too far in the delegation of responsibility and authority for the conduct of intercollegiate athletics? If so, why?

Do college presidents have the power, individually or in concert, to correct the ills associated with intercollegiate athletics? To what extent are they subject to undue influence on the part of legislators, trustees, and alumni? to undue pressure from faculty and students?

What should the respective off-campus roles of legislators, trustees, and alumni be in the determination of policy for intercollegiate athletics?

What should the respective on-campus roles of faculty and students be in the determination of policy and in the administrative management of intercollegiate athletics?

To what extent and in what ways should an institution surrender autonomy for the conduct of its total athletic program to national athletic associations? to athletic conferences?

To what extent can an institution have an autonomous policy on individual sports (independent of conference and national association constraints)?

If federal legislation is adopted pertaining to the conduct of amateur sports, to what extents should higher institutions seek to:

protect their interests in its administration?

participate, through implementation of the objectives of the legislation, in the use of funds which it makes available?

Can a program of cooperation be developed between community clubs and colleges in the expansion of amateur sports on behalf of the public-at-large?

SOME RELATED ISSUES: One of the most difficult aspects of the principal inquirer's assignment in the conduct of the inquiry and in the preparation of this report has been the need to achieve some kind of equitable balance in responding to the respective interests of administrators and academicians. The former, college and university presidents in particular, are concerned about what one of them referred to as "clear and present problems" and interested in the possibility of mounting a national study which will have promise of producing some practical solutions. It is hoped that the questions posed above are germane to these concerns of administrators and that the answers made to them by the proposed commission will provide a basis of information and advice on which each higher institution can make its own individual decisions.

At the same time, it also hoped that the questions imply a need for the commission to concern itself with issues at the other end of the interest spectrum. There, academicians in fields such as the social and political sciences perceive intercollegiate athletics,

within the broader context of sports generally, as a focus on which to concentrate a study (or a basis from which to launch a broader study) of what they consider to be one of the most serious problems that will be facing our society in the years ahead: the discretionary use of leisure time. The balance of this subsection, after a paragraph of personal preamble by the principal inquirer, is devoted to a partial but suggestive listing of possible research topics among which the proposed commission might wish to make some choices in the interests not only of developing more informed answers to the basic "clear and present" questions posed above but also of responding to these broader social and political issues of which intercollegiate athletics are a part.

In his more visionary moments while pondering the problems and the promise of college sports, the principal inquirer was intrigued by the "sports-as-a-mirror-of-society" concept. If intercollegiate athletics and their excesses reflect the problems of society, then perhaps it follows that reforming intercollegiate athletics may also have an impact on society? For example, if excesses in the recruiting of athletes and Watergate are both symptoms of the "win at any cost" philosophy, a call for a change in the conduct of college sports could have an impact on the perception of a sports-minded public about the need for change in the conduct of politics. These propositions are central to the issues raised about the relationship of intercollegiate athletics to the higher education process: "What are the values being transmitted by inter-collegiate sports? To participants? To spectators? What should they be?" Although these questions may not be the ones most likely to be raised

in that connection, their importance may, in the long run, transcend all others.

Here then is a partial listing of some of the topics that have been suggested for possible research exploration. The reader is advised to note that the listing is only suggestive of areas that the commission may wish to explore and that the tentative groupings of topics are more arbitrary than meaningful:

Sports and the Learning Process:

- Athletics as an area of continuous life experience, for participant and spectator -- a bridge between pre-college days and adult life -- an important aid to a smooth transition from childhood to adulthood.
- College athletics as providing order and discipline within campus cultures characterized by unstructured freedom and a new ambience of potential anarchic life styles.
- College athletics as providing immediate and unambiguous indicators of success or failure within a college experience characterized by ambiguity and uncertainty of achievements and rewards.
- Athletics as a literal rendering of the American dream, where rewards and status are based on ability and a hierarchy is legitimate.
- Athletics as an example of a setting in which the Protestant ethic has meaning.

Sports and the Social Institution:

Sports in relation to the democratization of higher education.

- Athletics as an arena for dealing honestly and directly with the competition and aggression that pervade university life but are seldom acknowledged.

- Athletics as one facet of a healthy diversity in campus life or as a source of tension and cleavage between subcultures.

- Athletics as lightening rod for passion and involvement in academic communities which value objectivity, detachment and neutrality.

- Sports and their seasons in relation to cycles of anti-social behavior and political activism.

Sports and the Corporate Institution:

- Athletics as reifier of the corporate identity and solidarity of large, diverse and democratic universities.

- The relationship between alumni giving for general institutional support and athletic success (or lack thereof).

- The relationship between the appropriation processes of state legislatures (and the outcomes thereof) and athletic success (or lack thereof).

- College athletics as antecedent to activities that are ancillary and complementary to them such as music and cheerleading.

Sports and the Citizen:

- Athletics as an influence on an individual's later adult outlook on life, whether that individual be student participant or spectator -- or subway alumnus.

- Sports as communicator of values to participant and spectator.

- Athletics as an antidote to anti-intellectualism in American life.

- Athletics as an antidote to an overly rational society which maintains links to a pre-technological culture.

- Athletics as an experience in human association and community -- for good or evil.

- Athletics as training in skills relevant to life styles in a leisure society.

- College spectator sports as a focus for exploration of the need to develop "a consumer ethic" in American life.

- Sports as a communal alternative to the aberration and anomie of modern urban mass society -- as a benign and voluntaristic substitute for religion or nationalism -- or a malignant and manufactured one.

- Sports as a healthy outlet for aggression; a useful and moral alternative to war, conflict, chauvinism, etc. -- or as opiate, diversion, and distortion of anger, frustration, resentment, etc.

Sports and Human Rights:

- College athletics as an opportunity for educational and thus social and economic mobility.

- Sports as a factor in the racial integration of formerly segregated colleges and universities.

- Sports as a continuing refuge for men from the ambiguity inherent in wordly occupational life and a new refuge for women who now question motherhood and aspire to careers.

- Sports as a traditional alternative potential for expression and identification by men and a new alternative for women.

- The effect of the repudiation of traditional sex roles by the counterculture on college sports.

RESEARCH APPROACH: It is suggested that the staff review the literature relevant to the topics to be discussed by the Commission and also direct a number of new inquiries about the financial, sociological and psychological role of sports in colleges and universities and the impact of college sports on society at large.

The following inquiries would most probably fall within the scope of the Commission:

(1) A series of in-depth studies, some twenty in number, of all phases of sports at different types of colleges and universities. It is suggested that some eight universities with major commitments to big-time sports, four two-year colleges, four colleges with strong low-profile sports programs, and four institutions with outstanding programs for rank-and-file participants be surveyed.

Each one of the institutions will be visited by a team of investigator-interviewers, and a case study written covering every facet of sports in that institution. The locus of sports policy determination will be investigated, with the role of the president, the administration, the faculty committees, etc., being carefully documented. The policy regarding recruiting practices will also be surveyed. The practices of scholarships for athletes and others will be contrasted, and special attention will be paid to the academic side of the care and feeding of athletes.

In addition, the perception of sports activities by leaders and rank-and-file students will be solicited. An attempt will be made to gauge the impact of various types of sports programs on the cohesion of the student body, the effect of athletic recruiting on integration, etc.

It is hoped that these case studies will put flesh-and-blood on the cold statistics about college sports.

(2) In addition, a number of data-gathering exercises will be conducted. For instance, to produce hard data about recruiting excesses, it is proposed that a questionnaire be designed for administration to a number of professional athletes who have attended college, as well as a questionnaire for current participants in big-time college sports to document their perception of "adequate remuneration."

Other surveys will be designed to probe the attitude of legislators and alumni about their perception of sports at the college level and its effect upon their support of institutions. It is also proposed to survey the impact of sports on life styles of former athletes, differentiating between those who participated in big-time and low-profile sports, and contrasting it with that of college graduates who were rank-and-file participants and non-participants.

An updating and an expansion of the survey of the costs of sports in Division I institutions is also anticipated. An attempt to estimate outlays and revenues sport by sport will be made.

(3) Information collected in the past will be fully tapped and re-analyzed. For instance, Gallop and Harris poll files will be searched for questions dealing with sports, and a general paper on the role of sports in society will be prepared using this data.

Existing studies will also be consulted and re-analyzed to throw light upon the pressures on finances of colleges and universities, analyses and projections will be prepared of attendance and receipts, and some estimates of the possible benefits of integrating college and amateur club sports facilities will be made.

It is also anticipated that more sophisticated studies such as one estimating the benefits of dominance in a given division will also be performed, and alternatives for redistribution of resources devoted to sports will be prepared.

The scope of the proposed studies is merely indicative of the problems likely to be tackled by the Commission. Additional studies will probably be requested by Commissioners, and it is anticipated that these additional inquiries will be conducted.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

The reader who has ventured this far and who is looking for a summary and some conclusions is advised to re-read the "Recommendation" and "Synopsis" which precede the principal report at the beginning of this volume.

AMERICAN COUNCIL ON EDUCATION

Roger W. Heyns, President

The American Council on Education, founded in 1918 and composed of national and regional educational associations and institutions of higher education, is the nation's major coordinating body for post-secondary education. Its purpose is to advance, through voluntary and cooperative action, the cause of education and the establishment and improvement of educational standards, policies, and procedures.